

Also, paper to accompany bill for the relief of estate of Green Guest, of Dekalb County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of estate of Levi Jones, of Marshall County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of estate of M. Light—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of John H. Wisdom, asking reference of post-office claim to Court of Claims—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of estate of Elizabeth Blakemore, of Cherokee County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CASSEL: Petition of Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Strasburg, Pa., for restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. CASSINGHAM: Petition of J. W. Lawrence et al., of Keene Hill Grange, favoring any law favorable to parcels post—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. COCKRAN of New York: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of Patrick C. Casper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Julia Davis, sister of William Galvin, deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Edward Donnelly—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Texas: Petition of Marshall Council, No. 232, United Commercial Weavers, favoring bill H. R. 13778—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Red River Lodge, No. 359, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, of Gainesville, Tex., favoring bill H. R. 7041—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Garfield Division, No. 219, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Marshall, Tex., favoring bill H. R. 7041—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Dr. James Saunders—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CROWLEY: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William H. Leonard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALZELL: Papers to accompany bill for relief of Solomon Spradling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota: Papers to accompany bill H. R. 17505—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EVANS: Petition for restriction of immigration, from Washington Camp, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Windber, Pa.—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the Marine Review, favoring the shipping bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Forest City Creamery Company, of Rockford, Ill., favoring the Quarles-Cooper bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Steel Roll Manufacturing Company, of Chicago, favoring increase of power of Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Railway Employees' Twentieth Century Club, of Illinois, favoring legislation compelling use of safety appliances and block system by railways—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Petition of Reeves & Co., of Columbus, Ind., favoring bill H. R. 16560—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HITCHCOCK: Papers to accompany bill for relief of Elizabeth Davis, wife of William R. Davis, deceased—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUFF: Petition of G. W. Perkins, of Chicago, against a reduction of tariff on tobacco from the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of R. L. Campbell et al., favoring bill H. R. 13778—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KLUTTZ: Papers to accompany bill for the relief of W. L. Bryan, of Boone, N. C.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KYLE: Petition of J. R. Wilson et al., favoring bill H. R. 13778—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the International Cigar Makers' Union, of Chicago, against a reduction of tariff on tobacco from the Philippines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LITTLE: Petition of citizens of Indian Territory, favoring removal of restrictions on land sales in Territory—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. NEVIN: Petition of Mrs. T. B. Flower et al., favor-

ing the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Mrs. L. B. Flower et al., against intoxicating liquor selling in Oklahoma and Arizona under any form of Government—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. OTJEN: Petition of the common council of Milwaukee, against closing Fairweather opening of breakwater—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RYAN: Petition of the Cigar Makers' International Union, against a reduction of tariff on tobacco from the Philippines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James W. Still—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SNOOK: Paper to accompany bill for the relief of Maggie M. Myers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEISSE: Petition of G. W. Perkins, of Chicago, against a reduction of tariff on tobacco from the Philippines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

MONDAY, January 23, 1905.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last, when, on request of Mr. LODGE, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal will stand approved.

DISTRICT MUNICIPAL BUILDING.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, requesting that the limit of cost for the construction of the municipal building for the District of Columbia, authorized by section 6 of the public building act, approved June 6, 1902, be increased from \$2,000,000 to \$2,500,000; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

SENATOR FROM MASSACHUSETTS.

Mr. LODGE presented the credentials of WINTHROP MURRAY CRANE, chosen by the legislature of the State of Massachusetts a Senator from that State to fill the vacancy in the term ending March 3, 1907, caused by the death of George Frisbie Hoar; which were read and ordered to be placed on file.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that Senator Crane, who is now present, may be sworn in.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will present himself at the desk and the Chair will administer the required oath.

Mr. CRANE was escorted to the Vice-President's desk by Mr. LODGE, and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him, he took his seat in the Senate.

CREDENTIALS.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented the credentials of ALBERT J. BEVERIDGE, chosen by the legislature of the State of Indiana a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1905; which were read and ordered to be filed.

Mr. PERKINS presented the credentials of Frank P. Flint, chosen by the legislature of the State of California a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1905; which were read and ordered to be filed.

Mr. CRANE presented the credentials of HENRY CABOT LODGE, chosen by the legislature of the State of Massachusetts a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1905; which were read and ordered to be filed.

Mr. HANSBROUGH presented the credentials of PORTER J. McCUMBER, chosen by the legislature of the State of North Dakota a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1905; which were read and ordered to be filed.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Mr. LODGE. I ask unanimous consent that the conference report on House bill 14623, the Philippine government bill, may be withdrawn and that it may be returned to the conferees. There is a correction necessary to be made in the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Massachusetts asks that the conference report on the Philippine bill may be taken from the Calendar and returned to the conferees on the part of the Senate. The Chair hears no objection, and that order is made.

Mr. LODGE subsequently said: A conference has to be held on the bill (H. R. 14623) to amend an act approved July 1, 1902, entitled "An act temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," and to amend an act approved March 8, 1902, entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenue for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," and to amend an act approved March 2, 1903, entitled "An act to establish a standard of value and to provide for a coinage system in the Philippine Islands," and to provide for the more efficient administration of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes. One of the conferees on the part of the Senate on the original conference, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] is absent from town, and I do not know how soon he will return. I ask unanimous consent that the Chair may appoint a third conferee on the part of the Senate to fill the vacancy caused by the absence of the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and the Chair will appoint the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS] as one of the conferees on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A remonstrance from the legislature of New Mexico against the statehood bill has been received. It was heretofore received in the shape of a telegram and it has already been read and printed in the Record. Therefore, nothing further is probably necessary to be done in relation to it.

Mr. KEAN. Let it lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The memorial will lie on the table.

Mr. ANKENY presented a petition of the legislative and finance committee of the Alaska Club, of Seattle, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to permit wood pulp and other manufactured products of timber to be exported from the Territory of Alaska; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. PROCTOR presented the memorial of Sarah J. Pike and sundry other citizens of Arlington, Vt., remonstrating against the repeal of the present anticanteen law; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of St. Albans Division, No. 24, Order of Railway Conductors, of St. Albans, Vt., and a petition of Bellows Falls Division, No. 106, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Windsor, Vt., praying for the passage of the so-called "employers' liability bill;" which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. SCOTT presented a petition of sundry citizens of Alderson, W. Va., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Retail Druggists' Association of Wheeling, W. Va., praying for the enactment of legislation to amend the Revised Statutes relating to patents on medicinal preparations; which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented the petition of W. K. Cummings, of Wellsburg, W. Va., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the protection of Indians against the liquor traffic in the new States to be formed; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented petitions of sundry citizens of the United States, praying that an investigation be made into the conditions existing in the Kongo Free State; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry army nurses of Upper Jay, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the pensions of army nurses; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of sundry pharmacists of Silver Springs, New York City, Yonkers, and White Plains, all in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to amend the patent laws relating to medicinal preparations; which were referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented petitions of the Women's Health Protective Association of New York City, of the New York Legislative League of New York City, and of the Woman's Republican Club of New York City, praying for the passage of the so-called "pure-food bill;" which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the National Tea Association of the United States, praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the compensation of United States tea examiners; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Hornersville, Howard, Rochester, and Vermillion, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the closing on Sunday of certain places of business in the District of Columbia; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented petitions of Local Divisions Nos. 311, 15, and 105, of Binghamton, Buffalo, and New York City, all of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers; of Local Lodges Nos. 623, 287, and 252, of Newburg, Fishkill on the Hudson, and Norwich, all of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; of Local Divisions Nos. 56, 9, and 391, of Albany, Elmira, and Northport, all of the Order of Railway Conductors, in the State of New York, praying for the passage of the so-called "employers' liability bill;" which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented memorials of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Willsboro, Reed Corners, Saratoga County, and Falconer; of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of the Friends' Church of Poplar Ridge, and of M. A. Du Mass, of Hannibal, all in the State of New York, remonstrating against the repeal of the present anticanteen law; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GAMBLE presented the petition of M. A. Cawood and sundry other citizens of Ames, S. Dak., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Indian Territory when admitted to statehood; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Christian Endeavor Union of Washington D. C., praying for the establishment of a special court for juveniles in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Central Labor Union of the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of legislation regulating employment of child labor, and also providing compulsory education in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. STEWART presented a petition of the congregation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Dallas, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Indian Territory when admitted to statehood; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Hornersville, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation requiring certain places of business in the District of Columbia to be closed on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Synod of West Virginia of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, praying for continued prohibition in the Indian Territory according to the treaty pledges with the Five Civilized Tribes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KEAN presented the memorials of Thomas H. Leonard, of Atlantic Highlands; Parker R. Bradley, of Orange; F. B. Lyon, of Trenton; C. H. Nevins, of East Orange; O. M. West, of Blairstown; J. L. Rice, of Bridgeton; D. H. Cranford, of Chatham; G. Allen Canfield, of East Orange; Frank Benjamin, of East Orange; H. W. Kice, of Wharton; William Maddil and Mrs. H. J. Conover, of Elmer; Frank M. Jeffery, of East Orange; Thomas Mathews and James Mathews, of Lumberton; William V. Jube, of East Orange, and of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Vineland and Cape May City, all in the State of New Jersey, remonstrating against the repeal of the present anticanteen law; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Eagle Brewing Company, of Jersey City, N. J., praying for the passage of the so-called "pure-food bill;" which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Estabrook Steel Pen Manufacturing Company, of Camden, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the protection of owners of trade-marks; which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented petitions of Samuel Sykes, of Paterson; of Charles Kuehne, of Jersey City, and of the Retail Druggists' Association of Paterson, all in the State of New Jersey, praying for the enactment of legislation to amend sections 4886 and 4887 of the Revised Statutes, relating to patents on medicinal preparations; which were referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented a petition of Palisade Lodge, No. 597, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Jersey City, N. J., pray-

ing for the passage of the so-called "employers' liability bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Lafayette Reformed Church, of Jersey City, N. J., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOR, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented the petition of William P. Finney and 149 other citizens of Moorestown, N. J., and a petition of the Synod of New Jersey of the Presbyterian Church of the United States, praying for continued prohibition in the Indian Territory; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KITTREDGE presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Lead, S. Dak., praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. TELLER presented a memorial of Local Union No. 306, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Pueblo, Colo., remonstrating against any reduction of the tariff on tobacco and cigars imported from the Philippine Islands; which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce and Board of Trade of Denver, Colo., remonstrating against any reduction of the tariff on raw or refined sugars imported from any country; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Hornellsville, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to require certain places of business to be closed on Sunday in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Canon City; of the North Side Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Denver, and of the Star Sunday School, of Mesa County, all in the State of Colorado, praying for the enactment of legislation for continued prohibition of the liquor traffic in the Indian Territory; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of the Real Estate Exchange of Denver, Colo., praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of the W. E. McGraw Lodge, No. 680, of Denver; of Snowy Range Lodge, No. 30, of Denver, and of Colorado City Lodge, No. 406, of Colorado City, all of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen; of Local Division No. 186, of Denver, and of Seven Castles Division, No. 515, of Basalt, all of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers; of Local Division No. 44, of Denver, and of Gold Coin Division, No. 375, of Florence, all of the Order of Railway Conductors; of Santa Fe Lodge, No. 244, of Pueblo, and of Pikes Peak Lodge, No. 215, of Colorado City, all of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, in the State of Colorado, praying for the passage of the so-called "employers' liability bill;" which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. DOLLIVER presented a petition of the Pharmaceutical Association of Davenport, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to amend the patent laws of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented a petition of the Commercial Exchange of Des Moines, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for untaxed denatured alcohol for industrial purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of J. J. Fast and sundry other citizens of Council Bluffs; of M. L. Ball and sundry other citizens of Winthrop, and of D. H. Philpott and sundry other citizens of Creston, all in the State of Iowa, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation requiring certain places of business in the District of Columbia to be closed on Sunday; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented the petition of Nancy M. Hill, department president of Army Nurses' Association of Iowa, of Dubuque, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the pensions of army nurses; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of W. H. Benson and 50 other citizens of Murray, Iowa; of B. F. Stockwell and 70 other citizens of Rowan, Iowa, and of the Presbyterian Synod of Iowa, praying for continued prohibition in the Indian Territory, according to the recent treaty pledges to the Five Civilized Tribes; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Druggists' Association of Portsmouth, N. H., and a petition of the Retail Druggists' Association of Chicago, Ill., praying for the adoption

of an amendment to sections 4886 and 4887 of the Revised Statutes, relating to patents on medicinal preparations; which were referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented a petition of the Douglas County Retail Druggists' Association, of Lawrence, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the efficiency of the Hospital Corps of the Navy; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the National Business League of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the proper regulation of transportation rates; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Brightwood Park Citizens' Association of the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of legislation providing compulsory education in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of the Trinity Christian Endeavor Society, of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings, grounds, and ships; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a memorial of the National Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Wellsboro, Pa., remonstrating against the repeal of the so-called "oleomargarine bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Hortons, Pa., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Coudersport, Pa., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the closing on Sunday of certain places of business in the District of Columbia; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Philadelphia and Towanda; of Trough Creek Grange, No. 444, Patrons of Husbandry, of Shamokin, and of the Merchants' Protective Association of Shamokin, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Columbia County, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation providing continued prohibition in the Indian Territory according to recent agreements with the Five Civilized Tribes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Strasburg, Lopez, Reynoldsville, Rathmel, Lees Cross Roads, Mount Pleasant Mills, and Trevorton; of Washington Camp No. 592, of Gibraltar; of Washington Camp No. 102, of Steelton; of Washington Camp No. 171, of Carlisle; of Washington Camp No. 649, of Red Hill; of Camp No. 210, of Ickesburg; of Camp No. 46, of Minersville; of Camp No. 640, of Windber; of Camp No. 62, of Gordon; of Washington Camp No. 641, of Pottstown; of Washington Camp No. 455, of Brisbin, and of Washington Camp No. 99, of Wernersville, all of the Patriotic Order, Sons of America, in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict the immigration of aliens into the United States; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I present the petitions of certain of my constituents relating to a seat in this body of a Senator from Utah. In doing so, I deem it proper to say this: I have great respect for the petitioners, and I have great respect for the right which they exercise to send petitions here. At the same time I believe that they have not considered the fact that it is a judicial question which this body has to decide nor the further fact that the evidence bearing upon that question is not before this body at the present time.

Under such circumstances, had I the opportunity to advise them, I would say to them that I did not deem petitions upon such a subject to be an appropriate matter to send to the Senate, and I only present them because of my recognition of the honorable purposes which they possess and my recognition of the right which they have to send the petitions here.

Mr. CULLOM. Will the Senator state the purpose of the petitions?

Mr. DANIEL. I stated that they relate to a seat occupied upon this floor by a Senator from Utah. They are the petitions of J. Earnest Thacker and other citizens of Norfolk, of Mrs. D. F. Swift and other citizens of Cape Charles, and of D. C. Perdue and other citizens of Norfolk, all in the State of Virginia.

Mr. CULLOM. I heard the remarks of the Senator, but I did not hear his statement in reference to the petitions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The petitions will be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. BEVERIDGE presented a memorial of the Ancient

Order of Hibernians, of Marion County, Ind., remonstrating against the ratification of international arbitration treaties; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CLAPP presented a petition of sundry citizens of Lanesboro and Canton, in the State of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Indian Territory when admitted to statehood; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. SPOONER presented a petition of the La Crosse County Retail Druggists' Association, of La Crosse, Wis., praying for the enactment of legislation amending sections 4886 and 4887 of the Revised Statutes, relating to patents affecting medicinal substances; which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented a memorial of Local Union No. 245, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Ashland, Wis., remonstrating against any reduction of the tariff on cigars and tobacco imported from the Philippines; which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

Mr. LONG presented petitions of T. T. Dunaway Division, No. 336, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Osawatimie; of Local Division No. 137, Order of Railway Conductors, of Osawatimie, and of Winfield Lodge, No. 245, Order of Railway Conductors, of Arkansas City, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the passage of the so-called "employers' liability bill;" which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Waverly, Kansas City, Nemaha County, Chanute, Council Grove, and Jewell City, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the sale of intoxicating liquors in new States to be formed; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FULTON presented the petition of Mrs. Belle V. Shaw, of Oregon, praying that she be granted a pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of Clark Walter, of Walla Walla, Wash., praying that he be granted an increase of pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented sundry papers in support of the bill to increase the pension of Henry E. Jones, of Portland, Oreg.; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of Maj. Alfred F. Sears, of Portland, Oreg., praying that he be granted an increase of pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of Victorius G. Haag, of Stayton, Oreg., praying that he be granted a pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of Alfred A. Woodin, of Portland, Oreg., praying that he be granted an increase of pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of Raaf W. Traver, of Forest Grove, Oreg., praying that he be granted an increase of pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of Lucy J. Bennett, of Portland, Oreg., praying that she be granted a pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the Linn County Business Council, Patrons of Husbandry, of Oregon, praying for the passage of the so-called "parcels-post bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the National Association of Retail Druggists of Portland, Oreg., praying for the enactment of legislation to amend sections 4886 and 4887 of the Revised Statutes, relating to patents on medicinal preparations and remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "parcels-post bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Newberg, Oreg., praying for the acquisition of the canal locks at the falls of the Willamette River, Oregon City, Oreg.; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Seattle, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the construction of naval vessels on the Pacific coast; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of La Grande, Oreg., praying for the passage of the so-called "employers' liability bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Oregon, praying for the adoption of a certain amendment to the suffrage clause in the statehood bill; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Oregon, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the appointment of incapacitated railway postal clerks as third-class

postmasters, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Nebraska, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting the States from disfranchising citizens of the United States on account of sex; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 406, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Colorado City, Colo., praying for the passage of the so-called "employers' liability bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the United Irish League, United Irish Societies, and the Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Cook County, Ill., remonstrating against the ratification of international arbitration treaties; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the American Forest Congress, praying for the protection and preservation of the forests of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and the Protection of Game.

He also presented a memorial of the legislature of Arizona, remonstrating against the union of that Territory with New Mexico in the new States to be formed; which was ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. CARMACK, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 9824) granting a pension to William Hayes;

A bill (H. R. 15308) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Prewett; and

A bill (H. R. 8049) granting an increase of pension to John S. Parker.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 6439) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Conroy;

A bill (S. 3378) granting an increase of pension to Jacob H. Heck;

A bill (S. 2256) granting an increase of pension to John Spriggs;

A bill (S. 2986) granting an increase of pension to William Barkis;

A bill (S. 3662) granting an increase of pension to William A. Wilkins;

A bill (S. 6097) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Clark;

A bill (S. 2674) granting a pension to Ellen Orr;

A bill (S. 4681) granting an increase of pension to John H. Stubbs;

A bill (S. 2291) granting an increase of pension to William W. Rollins;

A bill (S. 6445) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie A. Holden;

A bill (S. 6098) granting an increase of pension to Seth Lewis;

A bill (S. 6605) granting an increase of pension to Simeon V. Sherwood; and

A bill (S. 6699) granting an increase of pension to Moses Frost.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 6446) granting an increase of pension to John McGowan;

A bill (S. 6444) granting an increase of pension to Melkert H. Burton;

A bill (S. 3023) granting an increase of pension to Sanford A. Henderson;

A bill (S. 6438) granting a pension to Cyrell Boutiette;

A bill (S. 6718) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel Salg;

A bill (H. R. 17241) granting an increase of pension to David A. Miller;

A bill (H. R. 13082) granting an increase of pension to William E. Wheeler;

A bill (H. R. 5383) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Shafer;

A bill (H. R. 5153) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Stewart;

A bill (H. R. 4942) granting an increase of pension to Adam Hand;

A bill (H. R. 2476) granting an increase of pension to Sampson T. Grove;

A bill (H. R. 1491) granting an increase of pension to Martin L. Pemberton;

A bill (H. R. 968) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Young;

A bill (H. R. 963) granting an increase of pension to Ava D. Benjamin;

A bill (H. R. 606) granting an increase of pension to Vincent M. Cartwright;

A bill (H. R. 1324) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Skidmore;

A bill (H. R. 1445) granting an increase of pension to John Ellis;

A bill (H. R. 2469) granting an increase of pension to William Stone;

A bill (H. R. 14635) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Moore;

A bill (H. R. 15872) granting an increase of pension to Marvin Welton;

A bill (H. R. 7987) granting an increase of pension to Francis Scott;

A bill (H. R. 2946) granting an increase of pension to Albert Webb;

A bill (H. R. 2046) granting an increase of pension to Peter W. Kreeger;

A bill (H. R. 5286) granting an increase of pension to Obadiah J. Merrill;

A bill (H. R. 7074) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Sims;

A bill (H. R. 16109) granting a pension to Alice W. T. Groesbeck;

A bill (H. R. 15871) granting an increase of pension to John Leonard;

A bill (H. R. 14489) granting an increase of pension to John M. Porter;

A bill (H. R. 8708) granting an increase of pension to David C. Posey;

A bill (H. R. 4322) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Hay;

A bill (H. R. 666) granting an increase of pension to Eva M. Kingsbury; and

A bill (H. R. 5884) granting an increase of pension to Samuel K. White.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1724) granting an increase of pension to Sarah F. McCune;

A bill (S. 3914) granting an increase of pension to John W. Branch;

A bill (S. 1560) granting an increase of pension to William Sweet;

A bill (S. 3897) granting an increase of pension to G. H. Adams;

A bill (S. 4680) granting an increase of pension to Samuel T. Dixon; and

A bill (H. R. 7607) granting a pension to John W. Nye.

Mr. McCUMBER (for Mr. FOSTER of Washington), from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 5951) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. White;

A bill (H. R. 9906) granting an increase of pension to Thomas P. Dunn;

A bill (H. R. 15344) granting an increase of pension to William B. Atwater;

A bill (H. R. 15722) granting an increase of pension to David Guthrie;

A bill (H. R. 16807) granting an increase of pension to Elmer C. Jordan;

A bill (H. R. 16809) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Cotter;

A bill (H. R. 16311) granting an increase of pension to Morris Del Dowane; and

A bill (H. R. 15197) granting an increase of pension to Calvin C. Griffith.

Mr. McCUMBER (for Mr. FOSTER of Washington), from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3349) granting an increase of pension to Morgan Dwyer, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also (for Mr. FOSTER of Washington), from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported

them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 6381) granting an increase of pension to John Hamilton; and

A bill (S. 5813) granting an increase of pension to Herbert E. Farnsworth.

Mr. McCUMBER (for Mr. FOSTER of Washington), from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 5518) granting a pension to Bernard J. Boldermann;

A bill (S. 5819) granting an increase of pension to Samuel K. Long; and

A bill (S. 5253) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Mort.

Mr. BERRY, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 6607) to authorize the construction of a bridge over the Arkansas River at or near Van Buren, Ark., reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 6084) for the relief of George W. Green, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 6310) granting an increase of pension to Robert Clarke;

A bill (H. R. 16348) granting an increase of pension to Johnson Anderson;

A bill (H. R. 15850) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Shadman;

A bill (H. R. 16715) granting a pension to Helen Calvert;

A bill (H. R. 16481) granting an increase of pension to Frederick M. Halbritter;

A bill (H. R. 5243) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Qualk;

A bill (H. R. 16506) granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. Gray;

A bill (H. R. 5821) granting a pension to Mary A. Johns;

A bill (H. R. 16683) granting a pension to Jesse Peters;

A bill (H. R. 15893) granting an increase of pension to James A. McClung;

A bill (H. R. 16173) granting an increase of pension to Allen Riggs;

A bill (H. R. 4900) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Hodgson;

A bill (H. R. 4595) granting an increase of pension to Charles D. Fortney;

A bill (H. R. 16194) granting an increase of pension to James Gwyn;

A bill (H. R. 3373) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Cochran;

A bill (H. R. 132) granting an increase of pension to James P. Griffith;

A bill (H. R. 16483) granting an increase of pension to James H. Silcott;

A bill (H. R. 5822) granting an increase of pension to Eveline V. Ferguson;

A bill (H. R. 16480) granting an increase of pension to Preston Glover;

A bill (H. R. 9860) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Colvin;

A bill (H. R. 4169) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Brooks;

A bill (H. R. 15760) granting an increase of pension to John W. Strayer;

A bill (H. R. 13620) granting an increase of pension to Silas W. Squires;

A bill (H. R. 9774) granting an increase of pension to James M. Prince;

A bill (H. R. 16108) granting an increase of pension to Andrew S. Ray;

A bill (H. R. 16303) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Tyler;

A bill (S. 6026) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Girard Nichols;

A bill (S. 5059) granting an increase of pension to Tobias Meader;

A bill (S. 5316) granting a pension to Thomas Pickford;

A bill (S. 5960) granting an increase of pension to John A. Sargent;

A bill (S. 6344) granting an increase of pension to Richard B. Dickinson; and

A bill (H. R. 15660) granting an increase of pension to Jacob R. Sharretts.

Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2031) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Gay;

A bill (S. 6188) granting an increase of pension to William Sartwell;

A bill (S. 4573) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Buck;

A bill (S. 6475) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Slater;

A bill (S. 3953) granting an increase of pension to Thomas L. Sanborn;

A bill (S. 6586) granting an increase of pension to Laura E. Campbell;

A bill (S. 4814) granting an increase of pension to Marcia H. Edgerly; and

A bill (S. 6728) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Cowing.

Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 6526) granting an increase of pension to Stephen A. Cox; and

A bill (S. 6348) granting an increase of pension to Richard Edmund Hyde.

Mr. ALGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 6025) granting an increase of pension to Belle K. Theaker;

A bill (S. 5322) granting an increase of pension to Perley B. Dickerson;

A bill (S. 2464) granting an increase of pension to John Aylers;

A bill (S. 5234) granting an increase of pension to John R. Leavens; and

A bill (S. 4123) granting an increase of pension to George Simms.

Mr. ALGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 4552) granting an increase of pension to Orin P. Stoffer;

A bill (H. R. 2781) granting an increase of pension to Alta Mira Parsons;

A bill (H. R. 15864) granting a pension to Margaret La Parle;

A bill (H. R. 16259) granting an increase of pension to John Walz;

A bill (H. R. 4676) granting an increase of pension to James B. Judson;

A bill (H. R. 16263) granting an increase of pension to Llewellyn Niles; and

A bill (H. R. 16594) granting an increase of pension to Jacob A. Kryer.

Mr. ALGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1452) granting an increase of pension to Mahala Forkner, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. TALIAFERRO, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 16053) granting an increase of pension to Florence Emery Blake; and

A bill (S. 6554) granting an increase of pension to Martin Gillett.

Mr. TALIAFERRO, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4619) granting an increase of pension to Anna L. Bartleson, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 6550) granting a pension to Jane Johns;

A bill (S. 6654) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Dampier;

A bill (S. 6549) granting an increase of pension to Charles T. West;

A bill (S. 6548) granting an increase of pension to Livincy Walker; and

A bill (S. 6553) granting an increase of pension to Orlando Kennedy.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 4101) granting an increase of pension to James H. Cate; and

A bill (H. R. 2191) granting an increase of pension to William C. Pollard.

Mr. BURNHAM, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 16666) granting an increase of pension to Alfreda B. Coburn;

A bill (H. R. 13170) granting an increase of pension to Ruth M. Shepley, now Haskell;

A bill (H. R. 4194) granting a pension to Elizabeth Nellan;

A bill (H. R. 3286) granting an increase of pension to Jacob F. French;

A bill (H. R. 4873) granting an increase of pension to John McKenzie;

A bill (H. R. 3002) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Tillinghast;

A bill (H. R. 723) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Smart;

A bill (H. R. 16894) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Connor, alias James Boone;

A bill (H. R. 1573) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Hurd;

A bill (H. R. 15782) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Warner;

A bill (H. R. 15781) granting an increase of pension to Granville F. Plummer;

A bill (H. R. 15786) granting an increase of pension to Horatio W. Longa;

A bill (H. R. 15783) granting an increase of pension to Charles J. Richards;

A bill (H. R. 15784) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Wingate;

A bill (H. R. 15930) granting an increase of pension to William H. Cray; and

A bill (H. R. 8859) granting an increase of pension to Charles J. Esty.

Mr. OVERMAN, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 16171) granting an increase of pension to Sarah D. Tarver;

A bill (H. R. 16904) granting a pension to Louis Sherard;

A bill (H. R. 15802) granting an increase of pension to Martha F. Field; and

A bill (H. R. 16172) granting an increase of pension to Georgia A. Warren.

Mr. OVERMAN, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 5233) granting an increase of pension to Susan A. Reynolds, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BALL, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 4073) granting an increase of pension to Comfort W. Watson;

A bill (S. 4886) granting a pension to Mary A. Massey;

A bill (S. 5903) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Duffy;

A bill (S. 3722) granting a pension to John W. Victor; and

A bill (S. 6171) granting an increase of pension to Fannie C. Avis.

Mr. BALL, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3044) granting a pension to Lucy McEntee Andrews, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 6346) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Sheppard;

A bill (H. R. 16157) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Martin;

A bill (H. R. 15030) granting an increase of pension to David Rothschild;

A bill (H. R. 17093) granting an increase of pension to Felix Monaghan;

A bill (H. R. 14140) granting an increase of pension to William Y. Clinton;

A bill (H. R. 16260) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Hark;

A bill (H. R. 16199) granting an increase of pension to Joseph McGuckian;

A bill (H. R. 16124) granting an increase of pension to John Morgan;

A bill (H. R. 10712) granting a pension to Henrietta Weidner;

A bill (H. R. 16945) granting an increase of pension to Alvin B. Franklin;

A bill (H. R. 16087) granting an increase of pension to Harriet H. Brady;

A bill (H. R. 16704) granting an increase of pension to Michael Lewis;

A bill (H. R. 15855) granting an increase of pension to Loren Austin;

A bill (H. R. 15733) granting an increase of pension to Peter Horth;

A bill (H. R. 3799) granting a pension to Emma Cortright;

A bill (H. R. 15732) granting an increase of pension to Edwin O. Pierce;

A bill (H. R. 5123) granting a pension to Maria Eldred, formerly Maria Olmstead;

A bill (H. R. 16387) granting an increase of pension to Sarah F. Mathison;

A bill (H. R. 16141) granting an increase of pension to John Parks;

A bill (H. R. 16077) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Clark;

A bill (H. R. 16442) granting an increase of pension to Catherine E. Ray;

A bill (H. R. 16125) granting an increase of pension to Eugene C. Moger; and

A bill (H. R. 7000) granting an increase of pension to John White.

MESSENGER FOR COMMITTEE ON INTEROCEANIC CANALS.

Mr. PLATT of New York, from the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals, reported the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interoceanic Canals be, and it hereby is, authorized to employ a messenger whose services shall be devoted exclusively to the business of said committee, and who shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$1,440 per annum until otherwise provided by law.

COMMERCIAL RELATIONS AND REVIEW OF THE WORLD'S COMMERCE.

Mr. PLATT of New York, from the Committee on Printing, reported a concurrent resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed by the Public Printer 3,000 copies of the Commercial Relations of the United States for 1902, 2,000 copies of the Commercial Relations of the United States for 1903, and 2,000 copies of the summary entitled "Review of the World's Commerce for 1903" (forming part of the Commercial Relations for 1903) for the use of the Department of Commerce and Labor.

MONTHLY SUMMARY OF IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.

Mr. PLATT of New York. I am directed by the Committee on Printing to report a joint resolution, and I ask for its present consideration.

The joint resolution (S. R. 93) providing for the printing of the Monthly Summary of Imports and Exports published by the Department of Commerce and Labor was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That hereafter there shall be printed monthly by the Public Printer 7,500 copies of the Monthly Summary of Imports and Exports and other statistical information prepared in the Bureau of Statistics for publication by the Department of Commerce and Labor, 500 copies of which shall be for the use of the Senate, 1,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 6,000 copies for the use of the Department of Commerce and Labor.

That the joint resolution approved December 18, 1895, restricting the number of copies of the Monthly Summary to 3,500, shall be, and hereby is, rescinded.

Mr. SPOONER. How does the joint resolution originate? Is it a report?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is reported from the Committee on Printing.

Mr. SPOONER. Is it an original proposition or was the matter referred to that committee?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is an original report.

Mr. PLATT of New York. It came before the committee from the Department of Commerce and Labor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. ALLISON. I do not know but that this is a proper thing to do, Mr. President—

Mr. CULLOM. It ought to be looked into.

Mr. ALLISON. But it seems to be a new plan of securing public printing by these several concurrent and joint resolutions. I do not know but that it is a very important thing to do to print 7,500 copies of this Monthly Summary.

Mr. PLATT of New York. It is recommended by the Department of Commerce and Labor. That is all I know about it.

Mr. ALLISON. If they recommend the enlargement of this printing, that is very well, but I notice in the President's message a suggestion, which I think is an excellent one, that we are enlarging our printing too rapidly and that the expenditures for public printing are too great. I think, in view of that motion of the President, we ought to be careful about enlarging provisions for the printing of public documents.

Mr. PLATT of New York. The joint resolution is accompanied by a letter from the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor. I should like to have it read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The letter of the Secretary will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, January 16, 1905.

SIR: I beg to transmit herewith a draft of a joint resolution relating to the printing of the Monthly Summary of Imports and Exports, prepared in the Bureau of Statistics for publication by the Department of Commerce and Labor, and to request that if the resolution meets with the approval of your committee it be introduced in the Senate. The purpose of the resolution is to provide for the printing of a larger number of copies of the Monthly Summary, the present issue being altogether insufficient to meet the growing demand for this publication.

The Chief of the Bureau of Statistics states that "nearly the whole of the edition allowed the Bureau, namely, 2,000 copies by law and 1,000 by requisition, is required to supply commercial and trade bodies, the press, libraries of and teachers in colleges and other educational institutions, and our foreign exchanges, leaving but a few copies for distribution among merchants, manufacturers, and other applicants. The demand for this report has increased very rapidly in the last few years, and one of the largest sources of the increased demand is found in professors and teachers in colleges and schools, in which departments have been established for the purpose of imparting information in regard to commerce."

No increase has been asked in the number of copies provided for the use of the Senate (500) and the House of Representatives (1,000), as it was deemed expedient to leave that matter entirely to the committee.

Respectfully,

V. H. METCALF, Secretary.

HON. THOMAS C. PLATT,
Chairman Committee on Printing,
United States Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, I am not going to object to its consideration, but I desire to take this opportunity to concur in the remarks which have been made by the Senator from Iowa. I think that we are enlarging the printing of documents and other work at the Public Printing Office far beyond what is necessary or reasonable; that the expense has come to be alarming, and that there ought to be something done by the Committee on Printing, or by some other committee, which should limit the amount of printing which we are indulging in by resolutions passed without much consideration, often presented thoughtlessly, upon request. If Senators will go to our document room and to the folding room and see the tons of public documents which are there, never to be distributed apparently, and look into this matter they will become convinced, I think, as I am, that at least one-third of the printing ordered by Congress is utterly unnecessary, and I may say unwise.

I do not object to the consideration of the joint resolution, but I think that some committee ought to take up the matter and see if the amount of printing can not be reduced.

Mr. CULLOM. I should think that the time to begin is right now. I hope the joint resolution will go over, and that an actual start in the economy of printing shall begin. I ask that the joint resolution may go over for to-day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will go to the Calendar.

COMMERCIAL RELATIONS AND REVIEW OF THE WORLD'S COMMERCE.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, as to the resolution adopted just prior to the presentation of this one I should like to make an inquiry. Is it a joint or a concurrent resolution?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is a concurrent resolution.

Mr. BACON. I understand that it relates to the printing of public documents at the request of one of the Departments and that the larger part of the publication would go to the Department, a small proportion of it coming to Congress. Am I correct?

Mr. TELLER. All of the copies are to go to the Department.

Mr. BACON. All of them are to go to the Department. It is evident that the matter has not been looked into by the Senate. Personally, of course, I concede that the Committee on Printing has properly looked into it, but it is also true that members of

the Senate should have an opportunity to look into the matter. I therefore shall make a motion to reconsider the action of the Senate in reference to the concurrent resolution, in order that it may be looked into. It may be that upon an investigation the Senate may concur in the judgment of the Committee on Printing; but up to this time it has not had the opportunity to consider it, and as one resolution has gone over, I move to reconsider the other.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I wish to say, in justice to the Committee on Printing, that I know it considers resolutions for printing very carefully, and that it hesitates and declines to recommend in various instances resolutions which have been introduced for that purpose. But we have got into the habit of introducing resolutions to print anything and everything, and it seems to me that some limitation must be placed upon the printing ordered by Congress.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia moves to reconsider the vote by which the concurrent resolution just passed was agreed to.

Mr. PLATT of New York. I wish to confirm what the Senator from Connecticut has just said and to state that the Committee on Printing considers with a great deal of care everything that is sent to it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion made by the Senator from Georgia, to reconsider the vote by which the concurrent resolution was passed.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution goes to the Calendar.

SOUTHEASTERN DIVISION, JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF MISSOURI.

Mr. SPOONER. I am directed by the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 12898) to create a new division in the eastern judicial district of the State of Missouri, to report it favorably with an amendment.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill. It is a local matter, and the bill is only two pages long. It will take but a minute.

Mr. CULLOM. Let it be read.

The Secretary read the bill; and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary was in section 8, page 3, line 24, to strike out "nineteen hundred and four" and insert "nineteen hundred and five;" so as to read:

That this act shall be in force from and after the 31st day of July, A. D. 1905, and all acts or parts of acts so far as inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 6797) for the relief of the trustees of the Presbyterian Church of Fredericksburg, Va.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. McCREARY introduced a bill (S. 6798) for the relief of the trustees of the Presbyterian Church of Somerset, Ky.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 6799) granting a pension to Ezra Walker Abbott; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PROCTOR introduced a bill (S. 6800) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Packman; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CARMACK introduced a bill (S. 6801) for the relief of the legal representatives of the estate of Benjamin Lillard, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BAILEY (by request) introduced a bill (S. 6802) for the relief of the estate of Johnson Miller, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. STEWART introduced a bill (S. 6803) to regulate the practice of dentistry in the Indian Territory; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. ALGER introduced a bill (S. 6804) granting a pension to

Mary C. Leefe; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 6805) for the relief of Isalah Heylin McDonald; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GAMBLE introduced a bill (S. 6806) granting a pension to Aletha E. Reynolds; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FULTON introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 6807) granting a pension to Lucy J. Bennett;

A bill (S. 6808) granting a pension to Belle V. Shaw;

A bill (S. 6809) granting an increase of pension to Clark Walter;

A bill (S. 6810) granting an increase of pension to Alfred A. Woodin;

A bill (S. 6811) granting a pension to Victorius G. Haag;

A bill (S. 6812) granting an increase of pension to Raauf W. Traver; and

A bill (S. 6813) granting an increase of pension to Alfred F. Sears.

Mr. FULTON introduced a bill (S. 6814) for the relief of John Thurman; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6815) for the relief of the heirs of M. C. Mordecai; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6816) for a light-house at Cape Arago, Oregon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MARTIN introduced a bill (S. 6817) for the relief of E. A. R. Wyatt, heir of E. A. Wyatt, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. OVERMAN introduced a bill (S. 6818) for the relief of Hannah B. Sabiston; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. GIBSON introduced a bill (S. 6819) for the relief of the executors of the estate of Charles E. Conrad, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. STONE (by request) introduced a bill (S. 6820) for the relief of Wilhelmina Sharp; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PENROSE introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 6821) granting an increase of pension to David T. Field (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 6822) granting an increase of pension to Archibald K. Eddowes (with an accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 6823) granting an increase of pension to Joseph L. Webster.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 6824) to provide for the extension and enlargement of the public building at Lancaster, Pa.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6825) for the relief of the Corn Exchange National Bank of Philadelphia, Pa.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6826) to pay the Insurance Company of North America and the Insurance Company of the State of Pennsylvania certain amounts found due them under act of January 20, 1885; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6827) to correct the naval record of Jeremiah Bosworth; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6828) to amend section 4045 of the Revised Statutes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. PLATT of New York introduced a bill (S. 6829) for the purchase of a portrait of the late President William McKinley; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. BEVERIDGE introduced a bill (S. 6830) granting a pension to Eliza E. Winters; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6831) granting an increase of pension to Michael Quill; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6832) to further prescribe the duties of the secretary of the district of Alaska, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 6833) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Morrell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. KITREDGE introduced a bill (S. 6834) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River between Lyman County and Brule County, in the State of South Dakota; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. McCOMAS introduced a bill (S. 6835) to equalize the rank and pay of certain retired officers of the Marine Corps; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 95) to create a commission to examine into the subjects of citizenship of the United States, expatriation, and protection abroad; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXPENSES OF INAUGURAL CEREMONIES.

Mr. SPOONER. I introduce a joint resolution, for which I ask present consideration.

The joint resolution (S. R. 94) to enable the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States March 4, 1905, was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That to enable the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House of Representatives to pay the necessary expenses of the inaugural ceremonies of the President of the United States March 4, 1905, in accordance with such programme as may be adopted by the joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives appointed under a concurrent resolution of the two Houses, including the pay for extra police for three days, at \$3 per day, there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$7,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, the same to be immediately available.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. GAMBLE submitted an amendment authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Louisa Miller, a member of the Sisseton and Wahpeton band of Sioux Indians, for lands heretofore allotted to her in the State of South Dakota, intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. PENROSE submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$51,000 for the pay of not exceeding 30 dental surgeons and providing for their appointment as acting assistant surgeons in the Navy, intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. PLATT of New York submitted an amendment authorizing an increase of the salaries of tea examiners at the various ports of the United States, not to exceed \$5,000 per annum, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McCOMAS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$22,500 out of any money in the Treasury of the United States belonging to the Osage Nation or tribe of Indians to pay Lorenzo A. Bailey, of Washington, D. C., for professional services rendered said Indians, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO STATEHOOD BILL.

Mr. BERRY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 14749) to enable the people of Oklahoma and of the Indian Territory to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; and to enable the people of New Mexico and of Arizona to form a constitution and State

government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; which was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed.

Mr. LONG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 14749) to enable the people of Oklahoma and of the Indian Territory to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; and to enable the people of New Mexico and of Arizona to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; which was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed.

EMPLOYMENT OF ASSISTANT CLERK.

Mr. CLAPP submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the chairman of the Senate Committee to Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service be, and is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk for the period of one month, at a salary of \$100. And the Secretary of the Senate is authorized to pay said salary from the contingent fund of the Senate.

FUR-SEAL HERD OF ALASKA.

Mr. TELLER submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That the Secretary of the Department of Commerce and Labor be, and he is hereby, directed to furnish for the information of the Senate copies of all regulations and instructions given by him to the agents of the Department in charge of affairs on the seal islands of Alaska, and copies of all the reports to the said Department which said agents have made during the season of 1904 relative to the condition and management of the fur-seal herd of Alaska.

STATUE OF JOHN JAMES INGALLS.

Mr. LONG submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed and bound in one volume the proceedings in Congress upon the acceptance of the statue of the late John James Ingalls 16,500 copies, of which 5,000 shall be for the use of the Senate, 10,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and the remaining 1,500 shall be for use and distribution by the governor of Kansas; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to have printed an engraving of said statue to accompany said proceedings, said engraving to be paid for out of the appropriation for the Bureau of Engraving and Printing.

DETAIL OF RETIRED ARMY OFFICERS.

Mr. PATTERSON submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

Resolved by the Senate, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate a list of all officers of the Army now on the retired list and who are detailed for service, giving the names of such officers, their rank, where located, and the service for which they are detailed.

FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 17094) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The pending question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 7, after line 7, it is proposed to strike out down to and including line 23 as amended.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President—

Mr. GORMAN. Before the Senator addresses the Senate on his amendment, I wish he would kindly yield to me for a moment.

Mr. TELLER. Certainly.

Mr. GORMAN. On Saturday last I offered an amendment, which the Senate adopted, to the amendment of the committee on page 8, line 14, after the word "Congress," to strike out "in detail for each place in each insular possession." I now move to reconsider the vote by which that amendment to the committee amendment was adopted, with the intention when that is done to withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Maryland moves to reconsider the vote by which the amendment, which will be stated, to the amendment of the committee was adopted.

The SECRETARY. On page 8, line 14, after the word "Congress," the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, struck out the words "in detail for each place in each insular possession."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senator from Maryland to the amendment of the committee was adopted.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. GORMAN. I now withdraw the amendment. I do so for the reason that it was offered hastily, and I now find that it rather destroys the purpose I had in view.

Mr. HALE. Now, Mr. President, to meet the object which the Senator from Maryland had in view, on which all of us are in accord, I move to amend the amendment of the committee by adding to the committee amendment the words which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the Senator from Maine to the amendment of the committee will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 8, line 15, after the word "possession," at the end of the committee amendment, it is proposed to add "with a statement covering the total cost of such work in each place when completed."

Mr. HALE. Now read the whole amendment as it will stand if my amendment be adopted.

The Secretary read as follows:

Hereafter all estimates for fortifications for the insular possessions of the United States, including all defensive work, and all ordnance and carriages and machinery, shall be made and submitted to Congress in detail for each place in each insular possession, with a statement covering the total cost of such work in each place when completed.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, as I understand the amendment of the Senator from Maine, it is intended to cover only the projects that are referred to in the last report of the Secretary of War, on page 13, as to four or five harbors, which include one in the Philippines, one in Honolulu, and so on.

Mr. HALE. It covers, Mr. President, every place for which next year the Department sends in estimates in detail. We shall know then not only where the money is to be spent, which we ought to know, but we shall also know what scheme they have in view for the completion of works in those places, whatever they are, for which the estimates are made.

Mr. GORMAN. But, as I understand the Senator's view—and it is mine—it is not intended by the amendment to enlarge the projects. I suppose now that we have insular possessions, everybody is in favor of the fortification of at least one of the great places—Manila Bay, for instance, and Honolulu—but not that we will by the adoption of this amendment make a suggestion for any enlargement of the projects that have already been referred to by the Secretary of War, or increase their number. I certainly do not desire to have it understood that there is even a faint suggestion that we shall go on and enlarge the projects, but only that we are to have a detailed estimate of the entire cost of the works already projected. I understand that is the effect of the amendment offered by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. HALE. Yes; that is the intention; so that we may know in detail all about them.

Mr. PERKINS. It is only just to the War Department that I should state that this information has heretofore been furnished confidentially by the Board on Fortifications and Ordnance to the Committee on Appropriations, but they have not deemed it advisable to publish it. I understand, according to the amendment which has been agreed to, that hereafter this information will be published in the Book of Estimates.

Mr. HALE. It will be submitted to the same crucible that all other estimates are. The Senate will then know that which it does not know—where the money is going, how much for each place, and what is the scheme for the final completion of the work. I do not think it is necessary that there should be anything furtive or secret about this matter. If there was any time when that condition existed, it has passed away, and Congress, which appropriates the money, ought to know where it is going and what the future has in contemplation for each place.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, the committee will accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, there can be no intelligent and useful system of fortifications that is not based upon the consideration of all the places that ought to be, and necessarily must be, defended in time of war. You may fortify the Bay of Manila, and if you leave unfortified a large number of other places you have practically wasted the money you put into Manila Bay.

I understand, Mr. President, that the War Department has a system of fortifications to be applied to the Philippine Islands, but I have never been able to find out what that system is. An examination of the map would indicate to me that if we enter upon the fortification of those islands at all, if we are going to

make them halfway invulnerable, it should be done in a systematic way. That is why I complained on Saturday that nobody knew where this money proposed to be appropriated was to be expended, that nobody knew what its relation would be to the next appropriation we should make, and that, therefore, we were not in any condition to make an appropriation of this kind.

Mr. President, if we are to hold those islands for any length of time, I would vote for an appropriation for the harbor of Manila; but if I knew that no other place in those islands was to be fortified, I should not vote for it, because that would be a useless expenditure of money.

When we undertook to fortify our Atlantic coast we provided in that system for the places where it was thought we might be liable to attack. The same course, in my opinion, should also be adopted in this case. We have already expended some money, and we are about to expend more. We are about to expend \$700,000, and nobody can tell us exactly why or what is to be done with the money.

We are to take some of our great guns from home, and we are to put them up over there somewhere in the islands, nobody knows where, except, perhaps, the War Department.

It seems to me it is the duty of the legislative branch of the Government, which has the responsibility of raising revenues and their expenditure, to know a great deal more about the proposed expenditure than anybody in this Chamber or in the other can know from any published reports that the Government has issued. I am not in favor of any great expenditures on these islands, because I have hoped that ultimately we should surrender their control to the people who, in my judgment, have the right to control them. In the hands of natives, with the fact known that we do not intend to let any other power interfere with them, there would be no necessity for any expenditure for fortifications.

The islands are a part of our possessions. An attack upon those islands would be practically an attack upon the United States. That is the weak place where, if we have any foreign complication or a war with any foreign nation, they will do exactly what we did to Spain—take the islands away if they can.

One reason why I have felt that we ought not to expend money on them is that I believe it is an injustice to the people of those islands for us to dominate and domineer those communities without their consent.

Besides that, for myself, I believe that for every dollar I vote out of the Treasury I am accountable to my constituency, which is the whole, entire people of the United States. I can not make a proper answer to them by saying "We are going to get great glory by raising these people from a low state to a higher plane of civilization." That is not the duty of this or any other Government as a government, except with respect to people who belong to it. If I could show to my constituents, or to the people at large, whom I consider my constituents as much as I do the people of Colorado, that great profit could be made by our connection with them, that great commerce could be built up, and that great gain would be made by the people at large, it would be an answer why I did vote to appropriate the public money for fortifications or other purposes in those islands.

But, Mr. President, there is not a man living, after the experience we have had since we took possession of the Philippine Islands, who would dare stand in this Chamber and assert that there is a prospect of any commercial advantage that will compensate for the expenditure we have already made or for a tithe of what is proposed in this bill.

Mr. President, I notice in the morning papers, first yesterday, that we are about to take another possession; that the island of Santo Domingo is already in our hands, and that we are about or have already guaranteed the integrity of that island. I do not desire to complain unnecessarily, even about the expenditures in the Philippine Islands. We got into that difficulty, perhaps unadvisedly and somewhat accidentally, but I do mean to complain when the Administration undertakes to get us into fresh difficulties of this kind. I do not myself believe that the American Government should be used as a constabulary to collect the debts of European creditors that may be owing to them in this part of the world. I do not understand that there is anything in the Monroe doctrine which requires us to do that. If Santo Domingo owes Europeans money, the Europeans ought to be allowed to collect that money according to international law and subject to the rules which govern civilized people.

I know the Secretary said in the article which appeared in the morning paper that we do not guarantee. While of course we do not guarantee the payment, we guarantee the maintenance of peace and order—a thing that has not existed for any

considerable length of time in the Santo Domingo Republic for many years. Mr. President, it is a great job which we have taken upon our hands. It means an army in Santo Domingo.

There is one particular feature of this case to which I wish simply to call the attention of the Senate for a moment and then I propose to dismiss the matter. I deny the right of the executive department of the Government to make any contract, any treaty, any protocol, or anything of that character which will bind the United States. It is an assumption on the part of the Executive of power that is clearly and unequivocally given to the legislative department of this Government, if it rests anywhere in the United States. The President has no more right and no more authority to bind the people of the United States by such an agreement than I have as a member of this body. It is not intended that that treaty or protocol or whatever it is called shall be submitted to us for our consideration, because we are told by the Secretary, or some one speaking for him, that our officers are already in possession of one port at least in that island. And then, again, we are told that on the 1st day of February we are to take absolute control of the financial affairs of that island.

I want some man in this Chamber, I want somebody somewhere, I want some lawyer to tell me where the authority of the United States is to make that kind of a contract and bind us. This may be a small matter; it may not involve us in very great difficulties; but after all it is a step in a direction against which I want to enter my protest.

Under our Constitution we have a legislative department, we have an executive department, we have a judicial department; and perhaps in no country in the world has there ever been a more marked distinction made in the Constitution between the powers of these several departments. I regard the action of the Executive, through the Secretary of State, as a gross violation of the rights of the legislative department of this Government.

It is true, Mr. President, as I repeat, that no great complications may come out of it; it is true it may not cost us a great sum of money; but it is a departure from the fundamental principles upon which this Government was established. A departure in a small case may form a precedent for a departure in a great case.

So I do not hesitate to say that I think this is the time for the American Senate to say whether they approve of this method of procedure or not. For myself I have no hesitation in saying that I believe a departure of this kind will be followed by another and another until there shall be but little distinction between the departments, and, as the history of the world shows has been the case in almost every government of the world, eventually the executive power will become the sole power. Our safety in maintaining the wisest built Government that men ever erected is in maintaining the wide distinction they made between the executive, the legislative, and the judicial, and keeping each one a check upon the other.

Mr. President, I have not made these remarks because I thought they were likely to change the attitude of the Senate on this bill or on any other. I have made them because I believe it my duty to enter this protest.

I ask permission to insert the article to which I referred in my remarks.

The article referred to is as follows:

AVERTS GREAT PERIL.—MR. LOOMIS EXPLAINS OUR DEAL WITH SANTO DOMINGO—SCOPE OF MONROE DOCTRINE—CAN NOT BE USED AS SHIELD BY AMERICAN REPUBLICS TO DENY JUSTICE TO OTHER GOVERNMENTS—AGREEMENT TO ASSIST IN ADMINISTRATION OF REVENUES ENTERED INTO ON INVITATION OF DOMINICANS.

After a consultation with Secretary Hay the following statement regarding the situation in Santo Domingo was issued by Assistant Secretary Loomis yesterday:

"The Dominican Republic, after mature consideration of existing conditions, has formally and freely invited the Government of the United States to assist it in the administration of its customs revenues and to aid it in establishing its fiscal system upon a firm and business-like basis. The Government of the United States having been explicitly, repeatedly, and emphatically informed by more than one of the great powers that it ought either to try to evolve some order out of the financial chaos in the Dominican Republic or assent to certain European creditors of that Republic doing this, and to the administration of the Dominican custom-houses by them, supported by their war ships, has deemed it advisable, in view of the unfortunate financial conditions in Santo Domingo, which for the last ten years have been rapidly growing worse, to accept the invitation of the Dominican Government, and therefore representatives of this Government and of Santo Domingo have signed a memorandum of a proposed agreement looking to the American control of the fiscal affairs, upon the request and with the consent of the Dominican Government.

"The United States proposes to guarantee the territorial integrity of the Dominican Republic. It is not the purpose of this Government to assume a protectorate over Santo Domingo or to interfere with or participate in its domestic affairs any further than the collection of its customs revenues, the necessary revision of its tariff laws, and the adjustment, through properly constituted tribunals or commissions, of its foreign claims, and its economic and fiscal organization on a sound basis may make it essential to do.

DECREE BY PRESIDENT MORALES.

"President Morales has signed a decree, which will be published to-day, in which the Government of the United States is officially asked to take full charge of all the Dominican custom-houses, to name all the employees, and to collect all the revenues, 45 per cent of which are to be returned to the Dominican Government for its current expenses. The balance is to be used to meet the interest charges on the acknowledged bonded indebtedness and other just obligations of the Republic. Any surplus will be turned over to the Dominican Government. The obligations representing the bonded indebtedness are largely owned by foreign creditors.

"The Government of the United States does not guarantee the debts of Santo Domingo or agree to provide for the payment of them, but only promises to try to so organize and adjust the fiscal administration of the country that in time their liquidation may be accomplished automatically and on a basis of equity toward all creditors. It is believed that if the Dominican revenues are wisely collected and disbursed all legitimate claims against the Republic will be ultimately satisfied.

"In this connection it may be added that under the award of the tribunal of arbitration of July 14, 1904, between the United States and Santo Domingo, in the sum of about \$4,500,000, the United States was given the right eventually to take possession of the four principal ports on the northern side of the island, and under the award the fiscal agent appointed by the United States is now in possession of the important custom-house at Puerto Plata.

QUESTIONS FRAUGHT WITH PERIL.

"The unfortunate financial condition of Santo Domingo more than once in the last decade has brought to the United States Government questions fraught with imminent peril. The Government of the United States could not, with due self-respect, allow the impression to deepen and gain currency that the Monroe doctrine can be used as a shield by an American republic to deny justice to other governments. Many foreign claims are just beyond peradventure, and, being held by citizens of various governments, the problem became increasingly more difficult as to how those claims could be satisfied under existing conditions with fair treatment toward all.

"In some respects a still more embarrassing feature of the situation has been that the Dominican Government has been compelled by force to pay grossly exorbitant claims, and the question has arisen whether the United States should interpose in such cases. Such interposition has never been resorted to perhaps but once in our history. Another deplorable feature of the financial situation in Santo Domingo is that her revenues have been crippled by granting, for a song, valuable concessions, which were exempted by stipulation from all taxation. Her interests have compelled the Dominican Government to disregard these promises of exemption from taxation, and this has resulted in numerous and increasing appeals to the Department of State to interfere.

"The Dominican Government itself reached the conclusion that its only hope of escape from bankruptcy was through the assistance of the United States Government in the organization of its finances. In view of these grave conditions the President has deemed it wise at this time to assent to the strongly expressed wish of the Dominican Government."

Rear-Admiral Charles D. Sigbee, commander in chief of the Caribbean squadron, reported his arrival at Santo Domingo city yesterday in the flagship *Newark*. Both the *Newark* and the *Castine* are now representing the United States in Santo Domingo waters, although the latter has been scheduled to carry Capt. A. C. Dillingham to San Juan, P. R., where he is to take the mail steamer for the United States.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] to the amendment of the committee.

MR. CARMACK. What is the amendment to the amendment?

MR. HALE. Requiring estimates in detail instead of in gross. It is agreed to by everybody.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], which will be stated.

THE SECRETARY. It is proposed, on page 7, after line 7, to strike out the remainder of the bill as amended down to and including line 23, as follows:

For construction of seacoast batteries in the insular possessions, \$700,000.

For the purchase, manufacture, test, and issue of seacoast cannon for coast defense for the insular possessions, including their carriages, sights, implements, equipments, and the machinery necessary for their manufacture at the arsenals, \$120,000.

Provided, That the Secretary of War is authorized to mount two 12-inch and three 10-inch breech-loading rifles on a corresponding number of carriages for which appropriation was made for the insular possessions in the fortification act approved April 21, 1904, and in addition thereto two 12-inch and two 10-inch rifles for the carriages for which estimates are now submitted, these guns being surplus on hand in excess of the number of carriages provided for emplacements in the United States.

MR. PERKINS. In reply to the Senator from Colorado, I desire to say simply that the committee in considering the bill, when they reached the provision referring to the insular possessions, did not consider the policy of the Government in acquiring the Philippine Islands; whether they were acquired by treaty, or by conquest, or by purchase. It was sufficient for them to realize the fact that they constitute an American province to-day; that the Stars and Stripes are flying over the fortifications and forts and other public buildings in every port and city in the Philippine Islands, and that this Government is responsible for law and order. Peace to-day reigns tranquilly throughout the Philippine Islands.

The committee considered the question whether they would recommend an appropriation for the harbor of Manila as a

naval base, as a protection to the naval coaling station, as a protection to the city, to the people, to the buildings, to the public structures for which we paid \$20,000,000.

As my friend the Senator from Colorado is aware, the island of Corregidor is at the entrance of Manila Bay. It commands the full situation north and south and west.

If we are to maintain possession of Manila and Corregidor Island as a naval station even, it is absolutely necessary that we should be in a position to defend it, not only for our commercial interests, but for the Navy, for it must have a place to rendezvous, it must have a place for a coaling station, and as a basis for its operations.

It therefore seemed to your committee a wise policy to make the appropriation.

It has been the policy to consider in executive session a report in detail for the fortification of the thirty-one forts, under what is known as the "Endicott board," and for which we have appropriated about \$90,000,000 during the past fifteen years.

Our friend the Senator from Colorado says very truly that for the insular possessions there has been no regular plan similar to that of the Endicott board, but the Board of Engineers and the Ordnance Department took into their counsel a naval officer and they agreed that it is absolutely necessary that the islands should be fortified to the extent your committee have recommended. Indeed, they recommended twice the sum, but we thought, under the circumstances, this being an era of economy, and inasmuch as it requires about two years to build a 10 or 12 inch gun and another year to place it in position, we would proceed with this work gradually, and next year make a similar appropriation.

I therefore hope, in the interest of our Government, in the interest of the public service, in the interest of the Philippine Islands and the city of Manila, that the motion made by the Senator from Colorado will not prevail, and that the bill as submitted by your committee will be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. CARMACK. I should like to ask the Senator from California whether there has ever been a report giving a general and systematic plan for the fortification of the Philippine Islands or any estimate for their fortification?

Mr. PERKINS. There has been a general plan adopted by the Engineer Department and the Ordnance Department, with the advice of the naval board, to the effect that there should be certain fortifications erected in the Philippine Islands—in Manila and Subig. The estimate of the Engineer Department for Manila amounted to \$1,095,000.

Mr. CARMACK. How much?

Mr. PERKINS. One million and ninety-five thousand dollars. That is for the engineering work, for the emplacements.

There has been no regular plan of fortification except for Corregidor Island and for Subig. Plans have been considered for other ports in Mindanao and other islands, but none have been agreed upon.

Mr. CARMACK. It seems to me it is time we did have some thoroughgoing estimate and plan of fortification for the Philippine Islands, if we are ever going to have any. I do not believe we ought to legislate piecemeal in this matter without knowing what is necessary in the way of fortifying the Philippine Islands.

The Senator says we must prepare ourselves to defend the Philippine Islands, and if so we must have a very elaborate and very costly system of fortifications. There is a coast line there twice as long, I believe, as the coast line of the United States. We must be prepared to defend every part of it, and I think we ought to have a detailed plan and estimate showing the cost of fortifying the Philippine Islands. It ought not to be kept from us any longer. We should know what it will cost and what it is necessary to do in order to make the Philippine Islands thoroughly defensible against any foreign enemy. I am going to vote against any such legislation as this until we do have something of that sort.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, if I understood the Senator from California correctly, he intimated that there was no well-defined plan of fortifications for our new possessions, but I wish to call his attention to the fact that the Secretary of War, in his last report, on page 17, says:

Projects for the defense of San Juan, P. R.; Pearl Harbor and Honolulu Harbor, Hawaii; San Luis d'Apra, Guam, and Manila Bay and Subig Bay, in the Philippines, have heretofore been made and approved, and estimates for the necessary construction transmitted to Congress. Congress, at its last session, by act of April 21, 1904, appropriated \$1,318,920 for beginning the work of fortifying our insular possessions.

Under this appropriation the work of actual construction of fortifications and their armament has begun in the Philippine Islands. The funds have been applied to heavy guns and batteries, which are costly and slow to build, leaving until later the lighter batteries, which in emergency could be rapidly completed and armed.

During the year the preparation of preliminary projects for emergency defenses of the more important harbors in the new insular possessions has been continued. Accurate surveys of a large number of battery sites have been completed, and actual construction of emplacements and installation of armament can follow at such rate of progress as may be determined upon by Congress.

I have been unable to find in any public document a detailed statement of what these numerous sites are which are to be fortified and what the cost will be.

I do find that under the act of last year appropriations amounting to \$1,318,920 were made for five or six forts which are specifically enumerated by the Secretary of War, and that the estimates for the same projects for this year are \$2,600,000. But you propose to appropriate \$936,000 under this bill.

I should like to ascertain from the Senator in charge of the bill if he has in his possession or if there has been submitted to the committee or to Congress any detailed statement of this whole project?

Mr. PERKINS. I call the Senator's attention to the report of the Chief of Engineers for last year, in which he estimates for Manila, Corregidor Island, for the engineering work, \$3,651,000. I suppose the guns, ordnance, etc., would be about four millions more. I have not the figures of the Ordnance Department. At Subig Bay \$997,000 is estimated for the engineering work, for emplacements, etc. The guns would probably amount to a million and a half more. It makes in all about \$10,000,000 that has been estimated for fortifications in the harbor of Manila and at Subig. Of course there are other places. At Iloilo it was \$574,000 and at Cebu \$708,900 for the engineering work, while the Ordnance Department will be approximately double that amount. Those are the only estimates of which I have any knowledge as having been furnished to Congress.

These fortifications were agreed upon by the Engineer Department and the Ordnance Department with the advice of a naval officer. Their report was submitted to the Secretary and met his approval, as appears in his report to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. GORMAN. That is twelve or fourteen million dollars for a few fortifications in the Philippine Islands. I ask the Senator now what the entire estimate for the remainder of the seven or eight points, such as Hawaii, would be?

Mr. PERKINS. San Juan, P. R., engineering, \$1,525,000; Honolulu and Pearl harbors, Hawaiian Islands, including \$526,100 for the acquisition of land, \$3,424,000; San Luis d'Apra, Guam, \$395,000. That completes all the estimates which have been submitted to your committee for the fortification of our insular possessions.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I desire to say simply a word about this matter. I think there are certain parts of the Philippine Islands to the fortification of which and the placing of armament there the Government can with propriety proceed, and I think our present action should be limited to such places, which I am now about to designate. Of course there is a general consensus upon the part of all men in public life, I think, with very few exceptions, that the time will come when it is the design of the United States Government practically to withdraw from the control of the government of the Philippine Islands; at the same time I think it is generally understood that whenever that day comes, whether it be near or remote, the United States Government will retain certain harbors for purposes of naval bases, coaling stations, etc. And it is not very greatly in doubt as to what localities would thus be selected. Subig Bay is one of them. I have no hesitation in the opinion—I may be mistaken about it—that ultimately the United States Government, even if it should surrender the sovereignty of those islands, would retain Subig Bay because of its advantages in all particulars as a naval base.

Mr. PERKINS. The Senator from Georgia has been in Manila. May I ask him if he does not also believe it to the interests of the Government to retain and fortify Corregidor Island and Harbor?

Mr. BACON. I was coming to that. I was intending to say a word on that also. I was about to conclude what I had to say of Subig Bay with the statement that I thought, in the confidence we have that such would be the ultimate action of this Government, we might with propriety go to all the expenditure which might be reasonably deemed sufficient for the proper fortification and armament of Subig Bay. The probability as to Manila may not be so great from the fact that it is not so well adapted for the particular purposes of a coaling station. By reason of the size of Manila Bay and the turbulence of its waters it is not so well suited for the purposes of a harbor.

At the same time, I think the fortification, with reasonable limitations, of Corregidor Island is very proper if it could be

done for what I consider to be a comparatively slight expense, and it can be made a perfect defense to the entrance to Manila Bay. It is situated at the mouth of the entrance to the bay, with a deep sea channel on each side of it, being itself very little more than a couple of mountains.

But, Mr. President, when you come to speak of the fortification, at a large expense, of other localities than those two it seems to me to be not only unwise, but unnecessary. It is an impossibility, as has been suggested in this debate, that the Government of the United States can undertake the fortification of all the islands of the Philippine group except at the most enormous expense, by reason of the vast coast line, of which the Senator from Tennessee has spoken. Cebu and Iloilo are neither of them places where it is at all probable that the Government of the United States would ever desire to establish naval stations, and while I would be perfectly willing to vote for the proper fortification and armament of fortifications at Subig and also on Corregidor Island, I do think that it is an unnecessary expense and one from which we can hope in the long run to derive no benefit to seek out other places throughout that vast archipelago and expend money in their fortification and armament.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, I will state to my friend from Georgia that this bill does not provide for any other appropriation in the Philippine Islands except for Subig Bay and Corregidor Island.

Mr. BACON. I misunderstood the Senator, then. I understood him to say that the estimates also contemplated the fortification of the island of Cebu, and Iloilo, and that while the bill does not specify the particular places upon which the expenditures are to be made, it does make appropriations with a view to meeting the estimates.

Mr. PERKINS. There is no estimate before your committee except the preliminary survey which has been made there. I am in full accord with the views expressed by the Senator from Georgia. Your committee do not understand that this money can be diverted for any other purpose except that which I have indicated, which is the emplacement of guns at Manila Bay, and we order the transfer of those guns which we have here now available for that purpose.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from California the amount it is proposed to be expended in fortifications at Subig Bay, or Manila, or elsewhere. What is the extent of the appropriation?

Mr. PERKINS. We make no appropriation for Subig Bay in this bill. There is \$700,000 appropriated for Corregidor Island, in Manila Bay.

Mr. MONEY. And no appropriation for any other point?

Mr. PERKINS. No appropriation for any other point except one at which it is proposed to place four 6-inch guns and four 3-inch guns.

Mr. MONEY. It seems a little like an anomaly that the United States should expend any sum of money to fortify possessions on the other side of the globe after the Senate by a solemn resolution decided by the casting vote of the President of the Senate that it should never be considered territory of the United States nor its citizens or subjects citizens of the United States. I do not like the idea. It seems to me to involve permanent possession. If we are going to undertake the trouble and expend the money to fortify those islands it appears to me that we are taking root there to stay. I know it is a very agreeable idea that we are there to stay. A very distinguished Republican gentleman outside of the Senate has seized upon an opportunity to declare to the world that we are there to stay. Now, I am not willing to entertain that idea, for I solemnly believe the American people will after a while reach a lucid interval and will themselves decline to have anything to do with that archipelago or anybody on it.

I believe the time will come, and very soon, too, when we will find it extremely to our interest to relinquish any control whatever of that archipelago. Events are transpiring to-day in the East which significantly point to the fact that Japan is about to increase her continental possessions, and having gratified the ambition for continental expansion it is perfectly natural that she should desire insular expansion. She has Formosa now by virtue of the indemnity exacted from China for the war ten years ago, and it is perfectly natural that she should reach farther south. Perhaps we would find that the people of Japan are the people most capable of instructing and governing the people of the Philippines, if they need any master or any controlling power or any instruction. I, for my part, believe they are able to take care of themselves, as every other people in the world are able to take care of themselves. I believe those people, although composed of a mixture of the col-

ored race with the white race, are able to manage their own affairs, and that they do not need a constable to collect their debts or a big stick to compel them to pay them.

These appropriations for permanent possessions all around the globe do not meet my idea of the powers of the Government of the United States of America. It is true the nation can do what it pleases, because it is here in power. It may provide a form of government by which and under which they may choose to govern themselves. No such policy was in contemplation in that instrument which the nation has provided for its government, and until there is some change in that organic instrument there should be no such expenditures as those now contemplated by the bill.

Mr. PERKINS. I should like to ask my friend from Mississippi if he does not think this a wise policy, even if for no other purpose than to protect our coaling station at Corregidor Island and as a basis for naval operations in the Indian Ocean? We own no naval station in the Indian Ocean or in the West. It seems to me that, leaving out all other questions, we ought to make this appropriation to fortify the island and to protect our coaling station, if for no other purpose.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President, I admit the pertinence of that question, and I will very cheerfully answer it. I do not believe we have any business over there which requires a coaling station. I do not believe that there is anything in the case which requires a coaling station or a fortification. We have voluntarily projected ourselves into what I may term the future storm center of the globe, for I conceive (I may be mistaken, however) that the wars of the future are to be in that sea, because there is constantly before the people of Europe, and I will say also of the United States, a partition and dismemberment of the great Empire of China. But I do not want to play the rôle of one of the robbers in that game. That is a rôle that a republic can not undertake. Therefore, I can see no necessity for a fort or for fortifications there except for that purpose.

I wish to say further, as I think the bar of secrecy has been removed from the debate, that a gentleman who represented the United States on the Commission of Paris stated here on this floor that one of the chief objects in taking possession of the Philippines was to secure a base of operations only 600 miles across the Chinese Sea, and when the time came to partition and dismember that great Empire we might have our part, as though we already had some sort of a claim upon that Government and that people. I am not living in the buccaneer age and I do not believe that the common sense of mankind will justify anything of that sort. We are to stay at home and attend to our business. It is none of our business to regulate the affairs of any other people whatever; and far above us, or below us, it ought to be to stoop to divide up and dismember a great empire, it makes no difference what our ideas may be of its capacity to govern itself and to manage its relations with the other nations of the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER].

Mr. TELLER. On that let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll, and several Senators answered to their names.

Mr. MONEY. I ask leave to interrupt the roll call so that the amendment may be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will suggest that that can not be done under the rule. The roll call will proceed.

Mr. CLARKE of Arkansas (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. MILLARD]. He is not in his seat, and therefore I withhold my vote. I should vote "yea," if he were present.

Mr. McCOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. MONEY (when his name was called). I am paired generally with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. I do not see him here, and I will therefore withhold my vote. If he were here, I should vote "yea."

Mr. PERKINS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN]. As he is not present, I will transfer my pair to the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. DRYDEN], and I will vote "nay."

Mr. PETTUS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. CRANE]. As he is not present, I withhold my vote.

Mr. STONE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. TALIAFERRO. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SCOTT]. In his absence, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. ELKINS. I will ask the Chair if the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

Mr. ELKINS. I am paired with the senior Senator from Texas, and therefore will not vote.

Mr. DEPEW (after having voted in the negative). Has the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. MCENERY] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

Mr. DEPEW. Then I withdraw my vote. I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. MCENERY].

Mr. BEVERIDGE (after having voted in the negative). I inadvertently voted, as I usually do, not observing that my permanent pair, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. CLARK], is absent. I observe that fact now, and therefore transfer my pair to the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL], and let my vote stand.

Mr. DEPEW. I transfer my pair to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], and vote "yea."

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I understand that the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL] is already paired; that the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. PETTUS] is paired with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. CRANE], and that he consents to transfer our pairs so that the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. CRANE] will stand paired with the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. CLARK], allowing both the Senator from Alabama and myself to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. PETTUS. I vote "yea."

Mr. WARREN. I will ask if the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that that Senator has not voted.

Mr. WARREN. Then I will not vote.

The result was announced—yeas 11, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—11.			
Bailey	Carmack	Latimer	Pettus
Bate	Clay	McCreary	Teller
Berry	Gorman	Patterson	
NAYS—29.			
Alger	Depew	Heyburn	Perkins
Allee	Dick	Hopkins	Platt, Conn.
Allison	Dolliver	Kean	Platt, N. Y.
Ankeny	Fairbanks	Kittredge	Spooner
Ball	Foraker	Lodge	Stewart
Beveridge	Frye	Long	
Burnham	Fulton	Millard	
Cullom	Gallinger	Nelson	
NOT VOTING—50.			
Aldrich	Daniel	Kearns	Penrose
Bacon	Dietrich	Knox	Proctor
Bard	Dillingham	McComas	Quarles
Blackburn	Dryden	McCumber	Scott
Burrows	Dubois	McEnery	Simmons
Burton	Elkins	McLaurin	Smoot
Clapp	Foster, La.	Mallory	Stone
Clarke, Ark.	Foster, Wash.	Martin	Taliaferro
Clark, Mont.	Gamble	Mitchell	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	Gibson	Money	Warren
Cockrell	Hale	Morgan	Wetmore
Crane	Hansbrough	Newlands	
Culbertson	Hawley	Overman	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum not having appeared, the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alger	Cockrell	Heyburn	Patterson
Allee	Crane	Kean	Perkins
Ankeny	Cullom	Latimer	Pettus
Bailey	Depew	Lodge	Platt, N. Y.
Ball	Dick	Long	Proctor
Bate	Dillingham	McComas	Scott
Berry	Dolliver	McCreary	Stewart
Beveridge	Elkins	McCumber	Stone
Burnham	Foraker	Millard	Teller
Carmack	Fulton	Money	Warren
Clark, Mont.	Gallinger	Nelson	
Clarke, Ark.	Gorman	Newlands	
Clay	Hansbrough	Overman	

Mr. MONEY. It is due to my colleague [Mr. McLAURIN] to state that he is absent on important business concerning his family. I expect him here every day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum of the Senate is present. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], on which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The roll will be again called.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELKINS (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. I will transfer that pair to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. DRYDEN], and vote "nay."

Mr. HANSBROUGH (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL]. That Senator being absent, I will withhold my vote. I should vote "nay," if he were present.

Mr. McCOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. PROCTOR (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY]. As he is not present, I will withhold my vote. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. SCOTT (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. TALIAFERRO]; but I will transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. STONE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK], and therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DILLINGHAM (after having voted in the negative). I inquire if the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. Then I withdraw my vote, as I have a general pair with that Senator.

Mr. PROCTOR. I will transfer my pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. MALLORY] to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. DIETRICH], and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. McCOMAS. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN] to the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. MONEY. I wish to again announce that my colleague [Mr. McLAURIN], who is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. FOSTER], is necessarily absent. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. LATIMER. I wish to state that my colleague [Mr. TILLMAN] is absent on account of sickness.

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—17.			
Bate	Daniel	Martin	Pettus
Berry	Dubois	Money	Teller
Carmack	Foster, La.	Morgan	
Clark, Mont.	Latimer	Overman	
Clay	McCreary	Patterson	
NAYS—38.			
Alger	Cullom	Hansbrough	Perkins
Allee	Depew	Heyburn	Platt, Conn.
Allison	Dick	Kean	Platt, N. Y.
Ankeny	Dolliver	Kittredge	Proctor
Ball	Elkins	Lodge	Scott
Bard	Fairbanks	Long	Spooner
Beveridge	Foraker	McComas	Stewart
Burnham	Frye	McCumber	Warren
Burrows	Fulton	Millard	
Crane	Gallinger	Nelson	
NOT VOTING—35.			
Aldrich	Culbertson	Hawley	Penrose
Bacon	Dietrich	Hopkins	Quarles
Bailey	Dillingham	Kearns	Simmons
Blackburn	Dryden	Knox	Smoot
Burton	Foster, Wash.	McEnery	Stone
Clapp	Gamble	McLaurin	Taliaferro
Clarke, Wyo.	Gibson	Mallory	Tillman
Clarke, Ark.	Gorman	Mitchell	Wetmore
Cockrell	Hale	Newlands	

So Mr. TELLER's amendment was rejected.

Mr. CARMACK. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, to come in after the amendment already adopted on page 8, line 15.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert after the amendment already adopted, on page 8, line 15, the following:

And the Secretary of War is hereby directed to report to Congress as soon as practicable a detailed plan of fortifications necessary to the proper defense of the insular possessions of the United States together with estimates of the cost of same.

Mr. CARMACK. I called the attention of the Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS] to the amendment the other morning, and I hope it will be acceptable to him.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President, I think the amendment reported by the committee as modified and reformed by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] covers the whole proposition. Therefore, I think

it is unnecessary to adopt the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CARMACK. Having been called out of the Chamber, I was not aware of the amendments and modifications referred to by the Senator from California.

Mr. PERKINS. I think the amendment already adopted covers the object the Senator from Tennessee has in view.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. CARMACK].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PERKINS. In the amendment of the committee adopted on Saturday, in line 1, after the semicolon at the end of the word "finders," I move to insert the word "and."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the first amendment heretofore adopted, in line 1, after the semicolon following the word "finders," to insert the word "and."

Mr. PERKINS. It will then read: "For installation of range and position finders; and for the purchase, etc."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. B. F. BARNES, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed the following joint resolution:

On January 23, 1905:

S. R. 77. Joint resolution providing for the reappointment of James B. Angell on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed with an amendment the bill (S. 5763) granting certain property to the county of Gloucester, N. J.; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution of the Senate providing for the acceptance from the State of Kansas of the statue of John J. Ingalls, to be placed in Statuary Hall.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 17474. An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 181. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to transfer to the militia cavalry organization at Chattanooga, Tenn., a certain unused portion of the national cemetery reservation at Chattanooga, Tenn.

ARBITRATION OF VENEZUELAN CASES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read:

The Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a communication from the Secretary of State covering the report of the agent of the United States in the arbitration of the Venezuelan cases before The Hague tribunal, with accompanying appendixes.

The attention of Congress is invited to the request of the Secretary of State that 500 copies of the report and appendixes be printed for the use of the Department of State.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 23, 1905.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is rather of the opinion that the papers desired to be printed should go to the Committee on Foreign Relations and be printed, but there is a special request in the message that 500 copies may be printed for the use of the Department of State. The Chair supposes that could be accomplished by a resolution referred to the Committee on Printing. In the absence of objection, the message will be printed, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

LEGAL REPRESENTATIVES OF GEORGE W. SOULE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The unfinished business, being the "statehood bill," so called, is now before the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BURNHAM. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate

proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 559) for the relief of the legal representatives of George W. Soule.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, understanding from the Senator from New Hampshire that his measure will take no time at all, I am willing to agree that the unfinished business shall be temporarily laid aside, if that be agreeable to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BATE] until the bill referred to by the Senator from New Hampshire shall have been considered. If it provokes any discussion, I shall not be willing to have the statehood bill delayed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside in order that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of the bill named by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BURNHAM]. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BURNHAM. I now ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill (S. 559) for the relief of the legal representatives of George W. Soule.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Ephraim Hunt and Julia M. Hunt, executors of the last will and testament of George W. Soule, deceased, the sum of \$31,500, for loss and damage sustained by said George W. Soule by reason of the seizure and appropriation, against his protest, for public purposes, by the collector of customs of San Francisco, Cal., in the year 1852, in the erection of the custom-house of the United States, of six stores, the property of said Soule, situate upon a certain square of land in the city of San Francisco, by him then occupied under claim title, and being the same land whereon said custom-house was erected, said sum of \$31,500, being the cost to said Soule of the erection of said stores in the year 1851; and said sum of money shall be in full payment and discharge of all claims, of every description whatever, on behalf of the estate of said George W. Soule, his heirs, and legal representatives, against the United States.

SEC. 2. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$31,500 for the purposes specified in this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STATEHOOD BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 14749) to enable the people of Oklahoma and of the Indian Territory to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; and to enable the people of New Mexico and of Arizona to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. BATE. Mr. President, I shall resume my remarks on the pending bill at the point where I left off at the adjournment on Friday last. I shall occupy but a short time with what I have to say this morning on the statehood bill, which, I think, is one of the most important we have ever had here or that we shall have for some time to come. Of course we all feel a deep interest in the subject, and I propose now giving my views on some phases of the measure which I have not heretofore discussed.

A recapitulation of the platform pledges of the great political parties as to the admission of these Territories as States in the Union carries the distinct understanding that each Territory was to be admitted to the Union as a State.

Joint statehood was never contemplated by either party, and this bill which keeps the word of promise to the ear breaks it to the hope of the people of each Territory by a forced cohabitation from which there is no divorce or separation, by even the omnipotent power of Congress, when once they have become States in the Union. Before such a condition of future peril the Senate may well hesitate to pronounce the bond of consolidation, which it can never dissolve.

There ought not to be any experimenting with the admission of States to the Union. Once in, they are there for weal or woe and forever, the indestructible members of our indestructible Union. "Distinct as billows, yet one as the sea."

These considerations seem to have impressed the Committee on Territories of the Fifty-seventh Congress, for the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] reporting for the new statehood bill, by Report No. 2206, says:

In conclusion the committee asks the Senate to consider the following: If it is a mistake not to admit these Territories at the present time, it is a mistake which can be remedied by any future Congress.

If it is a mistake to admit them and that mistake is consummated it never can be undone.

Is the mistake in either eventuality lessened in its consequences by combining the four Territories into two States?

That report in the Fifty-seventh Congress opposed the "omnibus bill" as singularly inharmonious, and accounted for its "lack of harmony" "only upon the principle that the admission of each Territory is a proposition standing by itself and that they are incapable of consideration 'bunched together.'" And yet in this Congress by making two bunches of the same materials, instead of one, they profess to find the most felicitous harmony in the consolidation of these Territories.

This new device for consolidating the people of Oklahoma with those of the Indian Territory into one State and for the consolidation of the two peoples of New Mexico and Arizona into another State presents anomalies which must create dissensions in the future among people so indissolubly united, as well as give trouble, annoyance, and vexation to the people of the United States, compelled to witness, without power to amend, the incongruities arising from conflicts in civilization which will restrict progress and retard prosperity in both States.

It must have been such consideration of public policy that moved the Republican convention of 1888 to declare in its platform that—

The government by Congress of the Territories is based upon necessity only, to the end that they may become States in the Union; therefore, whenever the conditions of population, material resources, public intelligence, and morality are such as to insure a stable local government therein the people of such Territories should be permitted, as a right inherent in them, the right to form for themselves constitutions and State governments and be admitted into the Union. Pending the preparation for statehood all officers thereof should be selected from the bona fide residents and citizens of the Territory wherein they are to serve.

And again in 1892 the Republican convention avowed the same purpose:

We favor the admission of the remaining Territories at the earliest practicable day, having due regard to the interests of the people of the Territories and of the United States.

The same declaration in the same language was repeated in the platform of 1896 by the Republican convention. And in 1890 the Republican convention declared:

We favor home rule for and the early admission to statehood of the Territories of New Mexico, Arizona, and Oklahoma.

It was not only by such party platform pledges that the Republican party stands committed to separate statehood, for the Committee on Territories of the Senate, through Senator Harrison, afterwards the Republican President, reporting in the Dakota case, voiced the sentiment and purpose of the whole people of the country on the admission of Territories into the Union that—

The right of the people of a Territory of the United States to form a constitution and State government, republican in form, and be admitted into the Union of States is so self-evident that it will not be questioned by any enlightened citizen of any State, providing the requisite conditions for admission heretofore recognized have been complied with and exist.

The "requisite conditions for admission heretofore recognized" is admitted to exist at present, since the bill provides for the admission of each Territory, but in the condition of the Siamese twins—inseparably bound together by a ligament invented by the Republicans of the House of Representatives.

It is against that ligament that protest is

made by the people of these Territories as contrary to precedent and in violation of the right of each Territory of the United States to form its constitution and to be admitted into the Union.

Never before has Congress required two Territories to form one constitution, but that the people of each Territory may make their own constitution, to suit their own conditions and perpetuate their institutions, with the sole condition that such constitution shall be republican in form.

It is useless to discuss at this day the requisite conditions of these Territories as to population, material resources, public intelligence, and morality, the existence of which the Republican platform of 1888 recognized as constituting the "right inherent" to each people to form for themselves, and not for another people, the constitution under which they were to come into the Union. The ligamentary form for binding two people into one State had not been invented previously to the present Congress. The device is unknown to our past history, and was never dreamed of by the statesmen—from Jefferson, in 1787, to 1900—who have blazed the way for new States into the Union.

The members of the Committee on Territories who protest against this ligamentary form of admission offer no objections to the admission of each Territory as a separate State. The size of the United States Senate as to its membership is regulated by the constitutional provision that "the Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each

State," and to deny a Territory, rightfully qualified, admission to the Union because such admission would increase the number of Senators is none the less a violation of the Constitution when it is not avowed, but yet operates to restrict the membership of the Senate.

The unconstitutional character of such a policy is none the less when four States are consolidated into two and only four Senators instead of eight increase the membership.

It may be a difficult problem in casuistry to reconcile the "inherent right" of a people qualified for admission by all existing precedents with the power of Congress to deny such admission; but the excuse that eight Senators are too many to come into the Senate at one time will hardly satisfy the people of the United States. It has been held by the Supreme Court of the United States that the power of Congress to acquire territory extended only to Territories for the purpose of admission as States into the Union. While no fixed rule of admission of States into the Union exists either in the Constitution or in previous legislation, the Supreme Court, by Chief Justice Taney, pointed out that—

There is certainly no power given by the Constitution to the Federal Government to establish or maintain colonies bordering on the United States or at a distance, to be ruled and governed at its own pleasure, nor to enlarge its territorial limits in any way except by the admission of new States.

It is upon that view of the Constitution that the "inherent right" to admission is recognized by the Republican platform of 1888. The admission as States is the ultimate purpose of all acquisition of territory, and such admission is not to be denied because it would increase the membership of the Senate.

I shall not occupy the time of the Senate in the discussion of the requisite condition of these Territories for admission, because the "hearing" by committees—not of the Senate, but House—the speeches of the Hon. J. F. WILSON, of Arizona, and the Hon. B. S. RODEY, of New Mexico, as parts of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, are within convenient reach of every Senator, and present in the fullest details the complete demonstration of the existence at present of every requisite which heretofore have constituted the precedents of admission. But I affirm, and I challenge contradiction, that there can not be found in all the legislation on the admission of States, from 1787 to the present time, either a precedent, an argument, or a reason for consolidation of two Territories into one State.

If any political reason for this condition exists, it has not been avowed and has not appeared in the report of any committee of either House of Congress, except in the report of the Committee on Territories of the Fifty-seventh Congress (Report No. 2206, pt. 1), where it was remarked that—

The admission of a new State involves:

First, the interests of the people of the new State; and

Second, the interests of the remainder of the Republic.

The second consideration is at least of equal weight with the first, since the new State has equal voting power in the upper branch of Congress with all the other States, and therefore the welfare of the nation is permanently affected.

Without controverting in any way the truth and accuracy of that "second consideration," the inquiry is pertinent whether the votes of Senators from Rhode Island, Delaware, and Nevada have affected the national welfare or can affect that welfare more than the votes of Senators from New Mexico, Arizona, and Oklahoma.

That report is the first intimation of the existence of such a reason for refusing statehood to qualified Territories that I have found in all the documents upon the subject.

Mr. Quay, from the same committee, reporting his "views," takes no such contracted view of a great question which affects the very constitution of the Senate, but reported:

That the Republican party in 1900 promised statehood to the Territories of Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma, while no such pledge was made or promised in the national convention for the Indian Territory, which is not now fit for statehood.

The bill and report which now, only two years later, proposes to join that Territory, then unfit for statehood, to Oklahoma ought to have told the Congress when and to what extent changes and improvements have taken place which now fit the Indian Territory to form one-half of a State.

The Territory of New Mexico alone covers 122,580 square miles, almost as large as the whole of New England, with New York and New Jersey combined, which have 123,450 square miles.

To that vast empire of square miles this bill proposes to add the Territory of Arizona, which in "1863 was cut off from New Mexico because of its unwieldiness." The area of the proposed State would be greater than that of all New England, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Maryland (twenty Senators). And that is why the people of Arizona object to being joined with New Mexico and having one State made of

the two. (Hearing of N. O. Murphy, ex-governor of Arizona, January 7, 1904.)

In such a State "the distance from one side to the other would be as far as it is from New York to Chicago," and without railway connection.

Governor Murphy added that—

There is nothing in common between the people. It would be very unwieldy and an expensive State to govern, and to my mind the proposition should be absurd to any intelligent citizen of the country.

That is the opinion and judgment of an ex-governor of Arizona, of a public man who has "served as secretary of the Territory, governor twice, and Delegate in Congress once." (Hearing, p. 33, in House of Representatives.) He had "yet to hear even one citizen favor the joint statehood proposition."

The reasons why not one citizen of either Territory favors the joint statehood proposition are difficult to find. The policy heretofore pursued by Congress in the admission of Territories has been that of dividing large areas; thus the Dakotas were separated because the two united had 148,445 square miles. The policy now of the present bill is that of uniting large areas. New Mexico has 122,580 square miles and Arizona 113,020 square miles—together 235,600 square miles. (Hearing, House of Representatives, p. 51.) The case of Texas can have no application, either in precedent or principle. Texas was an independent republic, which by treaty came into the Union on her own terms—that of being divided at her election into five States. That Texas has not elected to divide her territory is no justification for adding to the Union another empire in area only 30,000 square miles less than Texas.

The area of New Mexico and Arizona is not only too large, but it is divided by a range of mountains, which, while not inaccessible, is yet a barrier which compels long circuits to trade and travel, impeding progress and prosperity, as well as the means of good government.

But the objection of the peoples of each Territory arising from the vast extent of territory is not the only nor the most serious reason why not one citizen of either Territory has been found to favor joint statehood.

The laws and the customs of the people are different in their origin and in their application. Mr. Richardson, pushing this objection to joint statehood, said that—

we have grown up under somewhat different conditions and under an entirely different system of laws.

He further explained that difference in civilization as the—

difference of laws on irrigation, or water right; on mining; and there are a great many things that are different—indeed you might say that there is an entirely different system upon all lines—the educational laws are somewhat different.

And he added:

The suggestion of uniting these two Territories is new. It has never been done in the admission of States into the Union.

On the contrary, the policy of Congress has been to divide territory until a homogeneity of population was secured under laws and institutions with which the people were familiar.

Mr. RODEY, the Delegate from New Mexico, was advised that the people of the Territory of Arizona would vote as a unit against the bill for joint statehood, and that "60 or more per cent of the people of New Mexico would vote this minute to defeat a constitution under it."

Can there be "home rule" where conditions of Territorial laws, customs, and civilization are so divergent that the people of the Territories would seek to defeat joint statehood?

An examination of the hearing before the House Committee on the Territories will surprise the Senate with the positive repugnance of the people of New Mexico as well as those of Arizona to the combination of the two peoples proposed by the pending bill. To the expressions of that repugnance by the Delegate from New Mexico, Mr. RODEY, I will add that of Mr. Ellingwood, who was for five years United States attorney for the Territory:

If you can not benefit the Territory of Arizona, do not do her an injury. New Mexico does not want us tied to her, and we do not want to be tied to New Mexico. We want statehood, gentlemen of the committee, but we are not insane on the subject of statehood. If you can not admit Arizona with its 113,000 square miles, with its resources, with its American population, leave us out.

Gentlemen of the committee, take up the New Mexico bill and pass it, take up the Oklahoma bill and pass it, and let Arizona remain as it is rather than join us together. We will be loyal. We would prefer to remain a Territory absolutely indefinitely, forever, until we work out our own salvation. We will do it. For heaven's sake do not strike us in the face if you can not help us. This is the preference of the people. I know the conditions in the Territory, and no one will appear before you who will not tell you the same thing. Arizona is unanimous on this subject. We will not have it if we can help it.

Mr. President, it is not surprising that such an energetic ex-

pression of opposition to consolidation should have prompted the question:

By what authority do you speak on behalf of your Territory saying that you are united in opposition to being joined with any other Territory to form a State? Is it simply your judgment about it or has there been a vote or a town meeting?

To which Mr. Ellingwood replied:

I will state to the gentleman that since this question has been up I have been in every county in the Territory and nearly every town in every county. I am with the people all the time, I am in the courts with the jurors and witnesses all the time, and I have never heard one man in the Territory of Arizona express himself favorably to any such joining of the two Territories.

He had "never heard one man in the Territory of Arizona express himself favorably to any such joining of the two Territories."

The district attorney, in constant touch with the people, is thus emphatic in his affirmation of practical unanimity of the population in opposition to the consolidation. Can evidence be stronger or more conclusive?

It was asked of Mr. WILSON, the Delegate from Arizona, who alike honors Arizona as he is honored by it:

Supposing that you were confronted with the question whether you could be admitted with New Mexico or not not at all, would you rather wait, or would you rather be joined?

The reply was swift and pointed:

We would rather wait until the crack of doom before we would ever consent to it, and if stronger language is necessary I will use it.

Mr. ROBINSON. Is that the sentiment of your people?

Mr. WILSON. Yes, sir; absolutely.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will that sentiment change?

Mr. WILSON. It never will. It will only grow more violent.

The governor of Arizona, reporting to the Secretary of the Interior, is quoted by Senator BARD as saying:

While the people of Arizona are unanimous in their desire for the admission of the Territory as a State and feel that the longer this boon is denied them the longer is a great injustice being done to a hardy, honest, straightforward, and patriotic people, still they are as unanimous in their opposition to a union with any State or part of State or Territory, even though by such a union could the desired boon be attained.

They have withstood the dangers and vicissitudes of frontier life too many years; they have worked too hard to mold a State from the desert; they have expended too much time and energy in the upbuilding of their Territorial public institutions to at this late day desire to surrender control to others. * * * Arizonans desire admission to statehood, feeling sure that, under the stimulus given by the more stable form of government, Arizona will rapidly forge to the front and soon become one of the most prosperous of all the States of our Republic. They feel without exception that a union with the Territory of New Mexico as one State, by whatever name it may be known, would make a State too unwieldy for the proper administration of public affairs; that such a union would be disastrous to all concerned, and would be rather an obstacle than a help to progressive advancement for either.

And in his last report, for the year ended June 30, 1904, after the bill under discussion had been passed by the House, the governor of Arizona says (p. 14):

Finding themselves confronted with a plan to unite their Territory with New Mexico, the people of Arizona have protested vigorously, and they will continue to do so until they have defeated this repugnant scheme. The injustice of it should readily appeal to all. * * *

The two Territories, as they stand, are different in many ways. They have little in common; their lands are dissimilar. It is doubtful if they could ever become reconciled to exist under one form of State government.

* * * I can not add to the protest that has already been made by the people of the Territory of Arizona against this reprehensible measure, and I have only to say that they would desire that their Commonwealth remain a Territory indefinitely rather than be joined with New Mexico. They desire to come into the Union as the State of Arizona, with the present Territorial boundary, and until, in the wisdom of the nation's legislators, they are permitted to do this, they are content to remain as they are, trusting in the justice of the future years to bring the boon so earnestly sought.

I have repeated these quotations to emphasize the opposition and repugnance of these people of New Mexico to the combination. But Arizona is not more opposed to the consolidation than are the people of New Mexico.

From Governor Otero, a Republican in affiliation, the appointee of President McKinley, comes a not less emphatic protest:

There is no doubt that the great majority of the people of New Mexico are opposed to joining New Mexico and Arizona into one Commonwealth, as is proposed by pending legislation. Even the small percentage who would acquiesce in such a consolidation prefer single and separate statehood for each Territory. This is not due to any innate animosity between the two Territories, but to the inherent differences in population, in legislation, in industries, in contour, in ideals, and from an historic and ethnologic standpoint, not to mention that the consolidation of two Commonwealths like New Mexico and Arizona into one is unprecedented in American history.

And again, Mr. President—

The new State would be an unnatural and an unwilling alliance. It would be the coercion of two populations, which are unlike in character, in ambition, and largely in occupation. The union would be abhorrent to both. Simply because the two populations are in the Southwest the country should not suppose that they are alike or sympathetic.

The latest appeal to the Senate of the United States comes while we are debating the bill, and voices "the intensity of feeling" and the "loathing" of the people toward this union.

The president of the Bar Association of Arizona, in transmitting the resolutions of the Bar Association of Arizona, writes:

In this time of our peril we appeal to the Senate of the United States, and to each individual member thereof, not to put upon the people of Arizona the blight which this odious union will entail.

Adding that—

The people of this Territory are homogeneous, with similar tastes, ideals, and ambitions, and they have at great sacrifice established and maintained appropriate educational and charitable institutions conformable to those ideals and ambitions, and they desire the opportunity to work out their own destiny in accordance with those ideals.

There is nothing in common between the people of Arizona and those of New Mexico, and the topography of the country interdicts all intercourse and all interchange of commodities or ideas.

The combined area of the two Territories is too great for the convenient and economical administration of government.

The inhabitants of this Territory differ from those of New Mexico in race, government, ideas, political ambitions, and otherwise to such an extent as to make it impossible for the people of the two Territories to unite in harmonious conduct of a State government.

We therefore implore you not to lend your countenance or assistance to the passage of this measure, which, if it becomes a law, will practically disfranchise and enthrall as progressive, loyal, and patriotic a body of American citizens as any whom the members of your honorable body represent.

Separate, independent statehood has ever been the hope of our people, yet we willingly, gladly consent to defer the fruition of that hope indefinitely rather than incur the irremediable disaster of the submergence of our identity which the proposed union with New Mexico would entail.

And the Bar Association, a body of able and enlightened lawyers intrusted, in part, with the administration of laws and the dispensing of justice and right, are not less pronounced and emphatic in their protest against the combination.

Resolution.

The Arizona Bar Association, of Arizona, at a meeting held at the capital of the Territory, on December 27, 1904, adopted the following resolution:

Resolved, That this association protest against the admission of Arizona and New Mexico as one State into the Union, and offers this protest against the passage of the bill now pending on the following grounds:

First. It violates our sense of local pride; sentimental possibly, but a sentiment underlying and necessary to loyalty, patriotism, and the higher aspirations for good government and good citizenship.

Second. It subjects us to the domination of a majority heretofore strangers to us, living under different institutions, observing different customs, having different laws and different rules of property as to its acquisition, enjoyment, and disposition, subject to different environment, having different trade relations, and the larger proportion of whom can not and do not understand, speak, or write the English language.

Third. That such union involves either a concession by that majority of their laws, customs, and habits or an abandonment by us of ours, and the consequent unsettling of our laws and jurisprudence, which are the growth of nearly half a century of different, distinct, and separate government, and by experience shown to be adapted and adaptable to our institutions, customs, habits, and peculiar wishes.

Fourth. The union of these two Territories would create a State the area of which would be greater than Iowa, Michigan, New York, and all the New England States combined. This would entail extraordinary expenditure of money and time in the transaction of public business, working hardship and more or less operating to deprive us of participation in the transaction of our public affairs. It is, we submit, a cardinal principle of American institutions that the more nearly within the actual observation of the people the functions of a government are exercised, and the greater facility afforded them for actually participating therein, the safer those institutions are and the more economically, honestly, efficiently, and capably they are carried on.

These considerations principally, perhaps others, more than forty years ago induced a Congress of the United States to establish the government of the Territory of Arizona separate and apart from that of New Mexico. The lapse of time has not, we submit, rendered these reasons of less efficiency, but has, on the contrary, not only justified the act of that Congress, but emphasized and made more apparent and urgent the reasons that then prompted the separation. The proposed enabling act is violently opposed to our wishes and, as we deem it, will necessarily result in the subversion of our rights.

We therefore respectfully but most earnestly protest against the passage of the proposed law, implicitly believing that in so doing we express the sentiment of the vast and overwhelming majority of our people.

And as members of this honorable profession we appeal to the Congress of the United States that, as a matter of right and justice, this distasteful union be not imposed upon an unwilling people.

These are the views of recognized organs of public opinion in positions of trust and confidence, with opportunities of ascertaining the desires and aspirations of the people of each Territory; and they are positive and emphatic in protest and opposition to the blunder in legislation which this consolidation proposes that Congress shall make.

Those expressions of public opinion in the Territories in opposition to the consolidation are confronted only with the reports of majorities of two committees of Congress, composed of gentlemen with neither part nor lot in the future of these peoples, strangers to their laws and institutions, unfamiliar with the magnificent distances that separate their communities, but regarding an increase in the membership of the Senate as paramount to the prosperity and happiness of the millions of peo-

ple who, in the present as well as in the future, must bear the burden of the consolidation through all future times; for, once in the Union, neither the laws nor the Constitution provide a remedy, however great may be the evils resulting from consolidation.

The Democratic party has neither part nor lot in any political reason for consolidating two people with one State.

We stand with Jefferson in the ordinance of 1787, with Polk in 1849, with Buchanan in 1857, with Lincoln in 1863, and McKinley when he indorsed and ran on his platform for President, and upon that record of expansion which opens wide the door of the Union to every qualified Territory, regardless of the effect on the membership of the Senate; but we take no part in any ligamentary combination of peoples whose previous civilization and training unfit them for consolidation in vast empires of area.

The Democratic party has ever recognized that home rule was the inherent right of every organized people; and that as the people of the Territories grew in numbers, increased in wealth, and improved in educational facilities, and stood on a fair footing in these particulars with the States they were entitled by their inherent right of home rule to admission in the Union, regardless of any effect or influence on the membership of the Senate. It has been the policy of the Democratic party to shorten the period of probation and advance the time of admission because the idea of government by Congress of a distant people was repugnant to our conception of home rule.

President Polk in 1849, more than half a century ago, recognized that New Mexico was entitled to admission into the Union. What has been gained by the long delay which has held that people in a Territorial condition? It would tax the political ingenuity of a Senator to specify in what particular either the people of New Mexico or of the United States had been benefited by the denial of statehood to that Territory for fifty-six years. During all that period its people have paid the same Federal taxes that were collected of the people of the States. Its citizens responded with promptness to every call to the national defense. They were ever ready to perform every duty demanded of the people of the States. They have subdued the wilderness and made the desert places to blossom and fruit by the waters of irrigation. They have not failed in the performance of any duty, and yet they have been kept in a state of hope and expectancy while a less brave and stubborn people would have given up in despair. And now, in the ripeness of time, they see their hope of home rule dashed by a ligamentary connection with another people.

And how is it with Arizona? More than forty years ago the Republican party separated Arizona from New Mexico. The reasons for that separation are existent to-day—the same mountain range divides the Territories. But, for some unavowed reason, certain members of the present Republican party rebuke Mr. Lincoln and his advisers for dividing the Territories and by bill reunite what Mr. Lincoln divided, because that strange and inconsistent policy will keep down the membership of the Senate.

I can discover no other reason for combining people who were separated half a century ago, in which time the physical and natural conditions of their situation have developed institutions different from those of New Mexico, with which Arizona is again to be combined, with the result that only two Senators instead of four may be returned and become members of this body.

Oklahoma, a truly American community, has developed a remarkable prosperity, with institutions framed along American lines. She, too, is to be handicapped with carrying the Indian Territory into a new State.

The scheme for a combination of Territories seems to have gone through a process of development. In its infancy it took the shape of an "irrevocable ordinance," by which Oklahoma was to bind the people for all time to accept the Indian Territory at the pleasure of Congress.

What is an "irrevocable ordinance" in popular governments? Does the term mean that one legislature or one constitution can bind forever the coming generations from shaping their fundamental constitution to suit the exigencies that time may develop—that they are to be bound hand and foot in the shackles which the present generation may think proper to forge for them?

The so-called "irrevocable ordinance" has been abandoned and the plan of consolidation adopted, notwithstanding the declaration (in Report No. 2206, pt. 1) that the "admission of each Territory is a proposition standing by itself" and that "they are incapable of consideration bunched together."

The Democratic party has from the inception of the scheme of consolidation set its face in positive opposition, and that opposition was expressed most forcibly by the minority of the Com-

mittee on Territories which I had the honor to report in the second session of the Fifty-seventh Congress (Report 2335) in concise terms. The minority of the committee made no report at this session. A motion to recommit for that purpose was denied by the majority in the Senate, but on a former occasion they did make a report, from which I quote:

It has long been a settled doctrine of American polity, founded in wisdom and justice, that a Territory of the Union is, upon organization, clothed with the inchoate right of ultimate statehood—a right to be exercised in the discretion of Congress when the Territory is capable, by reason of its resources and population, to assume the duties and obligations of a free State.

The denial of this right, the reversal of this policy by an arbitrary exercise of power by Congress in forcing an unnatural union of Territories against the will of their people, the forcible union of peoples distinct in custom, habits, manner, and religion, is ultraradical and revolutionary.

Even more than that—it is the surrender of the power that four sovereign States would exercise in the Union if constitutional methods, as heretofore, were orderly followed in the admission of States. It is the last effort to minimize the influence of the West and Southwest in the citadel of Federal power, the United States Senate.

We are of the opinion that it will ultimately be better for the Union that the Territories opposed to consolidation shall be denied statehood under the theory of this bill indefinitely than the conditions that will be forced by an unnatural union should exist.

Mr. President, we find these Territories of Arizona and New Mexico lying side by side in the southwestern part of the country. They occupy in extent about 6 degrees of latitude, the northern line of which is on a line with the southern part of Kentucky and the southern part on a line with New Orleans, and is productive of cotton, sugar, cereals, vegetation, and fruits that are produced within that territorial range.

It is a vast extent of territory. It is about 800 miles, as the light gleams or the bird flies, from east to west, its longitude, as shown on the map, being 840 miles. There are 113,000 square miles in Arizona and a hundred and twenty two thousand square miles in New Mexico. Combined they make about 240,000 square miles.

It has been the policy of this Government to minimize the area of new States, instead of enlarging it. I believe that has been the case with many of our States. Take, for instance, Vermont. She came from eastern New York. And what was one of the principal reasons for making the State of Vermont?

If you will examine the records you will find that Vermont was taken from New York because it was said that the State of New York was too large and had too much power. There was much feeling about it, and the Government of the United States gave \$30,000 to New York as a bonus in the deal. Vermont, then, was taken off New York because New York was too large. That was the main reason urged, as will be found by an examination of the records.

Again, look at Massachusetts. Her territory extended far out northeast up the shore of the Atlantic Ocean, making an extended territory. The result was Maine was taken off of Massachusetts. Why? Because the area of Massachusetts was deemed unwieldy and inconvenient, and thus the area of Massachusetts was lessened.

Again, go south and you find there the Territory of Mississippi with its amazing production. Alabama was a part of Mississippi. Mississippi was considered too large and unwieldy for convenience and economy, and Alabama had to be stricken off and made a separate State. She is now one of the most flourishing, beautiful, and attractive States in this land of ours. Truly it fulfills the significance of the word "Alabama"—"Here we rest."

Again, Mr. President, see this very Territory over which we are contending—Arizona. The reasons of Mr. Lincoln and those given in the various speeches, especially by Senator Wade and others who discussed it at length, have been read by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], and I will not reiterate them. The main reason was that it was too large and that it should be minimized. The consensus of opinion by those Senatorial philosophers was that New Mexico should be divided so they could make a convenient and economical government of it by establishing the Territory of Arizona. Such was the case.

They have gone on in that Territorial government under the full belief that in due time it would become a State, and they have built up a large statehouse at an immense cost to those people. Now it is proposed to sweep that away and to put the capital at Santa Fe, a distance of more than 800 miles from the western part of that Territory to this capital, where a citizen would have to go to attend to any business connected with the State.

Such is the situation now, and such is the proposition in this bill. It is to reunite the two large Territories of Arizona and New Mexico, with their immense area combined of 235,000 square miles.

Not only are these vast areas unwieldy and inconvenient each in itself, but each of them has all the elements for a great State. Look for a moment at the vast and varied resources of these two Territories and see if each has not all the elements essential for a great State. I do not now care to particularize as to New Mexico, for that has already been done, ably and minutely, by Senators. It has been said in this debate that we should give statehood to New Mexico and let Arizona remain as she is. This would do injustice to Arizona, but this would be far better than to combine the two and thus swallow up the legal existence of Arizona and blot her out for all time. Some amendments to this bill are to that effect, to which I may refer hereafter. But as to Arizona, Mr. President, it is a fact that in Arizona the productions are absolutely amazing. She has her rivers, her mountains, her valleys; she has her desert, and she has the canyons in the sides of her mountains, where, in the natural progress of events, there will be reservoirs of waters established for the purpose of irrigation, and they will make that land bloom and blossom as a garden. There are greater possibilities for Arizona, in my opinion, than for any Territory in the United States, or even any State. The power irrigation will produce upon the soil is absolutely wonderful.

Look at her grasses and see the fat cattle that range her hills and browse on her mountain sides. See her railroads. She has two trunk lines, one the Southern Pacific and the other the Atlantic and Pacific, or the Santa Fe, as it is known. Those cross that mountain which is the natural barrier between Arizona and New Mexico, which nature's hand placed there, and which was recognized by President Buchanan, recognized by James K. Polk, and recognized and established and organized by Mr. Lincoln when the Arizona Territorial bill was passed by the Congress and signed by President Lincoln in 1863.

So you see, Mr. President, there are absolutely planted by the hand of nature distinct features, pointing as plain as fingerboards the way of single statehood to Arizona. What God has indicated should lead us. That mountain range—the Continental Divide—is the line now between the two and should so remain. There is the Perca River, running to the east from one side and to the west from the other side of this Continental Divide. The waters running east, strange as it may seem, after flowing for a distance of thousands of miles, find their way to the Gulf of Mexico, and at last make a part of that Gulf Stream which flows across the Atlantic Ocean. On the other side is the other Perca, just beyond the mountain where the Southern Pacific Railroad crosses, and you find that the waters run in the other direction and strike in the end the Colorado River, which is a large, splendid river coursing down through the southwestern part of this Territory, and finally finding its way into the Gulf of California and then into the Pacific Ocean.

So you see the barrier by which nature has divided these Territories, and you act in violation of nature when you put them together. They can not be united with safety in a political sense. They can not be united for the benefit of each other in a commercial sense. They can not be united with each other for the public good, and therefore should be kept apart.

See the fruit which is a profitable product in the western part of Arizona. It is wonderful. It has been said that no spot on earth produces as great a variety and to the same extent of development as the fruit Arizona produces upon her western slope, where the production of oranges, figs, limes, lemons, and all citrous fruits, pineapples, and all those southern fruits is remarkable.

There she is. Go to her mountains. Who has not seen upon the sides of the mountains of Arizona and New Mexico the splendid fruit in the way of apples that have been sent here, said to be the finest in the world? Orchards have been established there that are said to contain thousands of acres, and immense fortunes are being made. But it is not of the possibilities that I speak, but probabilities.

Now, take the water that will soon come through these canyons, which will become reservoirs and give nature's rain at will to these arid regions, and you will find them to bloom, beautify, and smile as genial as springtime. The Nile supported 60,000,000 people by her irrigation. India has become a garden in some spots by virtue of irrigation. Irrigation is almost as much of a wonder worker as electricity, and, Mr. President, when it is applied even moderately to Arizona, you will find that Arizona has no superior on this continent in her productions and her attractiveness.

Not only that, but her climate, especially on her elevated mesas and mountain sides, is delightful in many parts and is as a balm of Gilead to throat and lung trouble. It is the spot of the earth to which those unfortunates go and find relief.

Now, Mr. President, the distance is 800 miles from east to west as the bird flies or as the light gleams. Yes, it is 800 miles from Yuma, Ariz., to Santa Fe, the capital of the com-

bined States; and you propose to put them together by force, against the indication of nature, against the express will of the people, denying "home rule" to free and intelligent American citizens in violation of the policy of this Government, which has been from 1787 to lessen the territorial capacity and make solid small States that would be convenient and economical.

Such has been the policy of this Government for a hundred years. Now, will you violate it in this instance—the baldest instance, too, that ever occurred—because the territorial expanse is greater? Then why should it be done? What is the reason for it? Where is the political reason why you should propose to do it?

Mr. President, I do not believe it will be done. I believe that it will take the course of Dakota and other Territories. I saw sitting before me just now the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT]. I remember well his speech on the division of the Dakotas, for I heard it and have read it since. The speech referred to he made here in the Senate in 1888 in regard to the division and admission of Dakota. I have it before me, and it is so much better than I can express it in giving his reasons therefor that I beg permission to read a part of it.

When the question of the admission of Dakota was up with its large territory, it became a question very much the same we have now before the Senate as to whether it was not unwieldy and as to whether it was proper for it to remain in that condition with its broad area or whether it should be divided into two separate States under separate governments. That was the question involved, and Congress decided that it would divide it; and the most potential effect was the influence of the Senator from Connecticut, who has honored himself and honored his State and honored the Senate by a long service here. He it was who brought about, perhaps more than any other, the division of Dakota, and I am anxious when we reach the point to hear his vote on this question. I think it and believe he will be in favor of dividing these two large Territories and be on a line of consistency—"consistency is a jewel"—not to consolidate and combine them into one State.

The Senator from Connecticut on that occasion said what I shall read.

By the way, the Territory of Dakota was not so large as this, but it made 149,000 square miles, 72,000 in North Dakota, or what was then called "Lincoln Territory," and 77,000 in the southern part, which is now South Dakota, and which is ably represented in this Senate.

The two combined made 149,000 square miles, while New Mexico has 122,000 square miles, and Arizona has 113,000 square miles, and the two combined, as this bill seeks to do, would make a State containing 235,000 square miles. I contend that there is greater reason for dissolving them or keeping them apart and allowing them to be admitted as two independent States than in the case of the Dakotas. So thought the Senator from Connecticut. This discussion touching the Dakotas will be found in the Congressional Globe, No. 90, volume 19, part 3, page 2802, and subsequent pages. The Senator from Connecticut in that discussion uses the following strong language:

This leaves, as it seems to me, two questions only for discussion. First, should the Territory be divided? Second, should South Dakota be admitted now? To each of these questions the majority of the committee—

He fortified himself by referring to the action of the committee having the matter in charge—

To each of these questions the majority of the committee render a most unhesitating answer, Yes; the Territory should be divided—

"The Territory should be divided," he says—

and while I would respect the wishes of the inhabitants of the Territory to a great extent—

I hope he will hear this—

I am so strongly convinced that the Territory ought to be divided that, even against the wishes of a large portion of the population, I should feel that it ought to be divided for the benefit of the nation and for the future security of the rights of the other States in the Union.

Could language be stronger? Again, continuing straight along, he said:

It is too large for one State.

That was 149,000 square miles, while New Mexico and Arizona combined is 235,000 square miles. One hundred and forty-nine thousand is too large, he says. If so, the other is twice too large.

The Senator from Connecticut continues:

It is too large for one State. It is larger than anybody ever thought of making one State, with two exceptions. It is larger than anybody ever thought of making an agricultural State, with one exception, and that is the State of Texas, to which I shall allude further on.

I imagine that Senators do not realize the extent of that Territory or the size of the State which would be framed by admitting the whole

as a single State. When I say that it is 430 miles long from north to south and 400 miles from east to west, we do not even then get an idea of what a vast area that gives. We can get it only by comparison.

The whole Territory of Dakota is very much larger, and aside from the commercial advantages to be derived from a seacoast, which it lacks, it is as capable of sustaining a population as England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales. Those four countries, comprising Great Britain, have 122,157 square miles.

Just the size exactly, do you not see, of New Mexico alone without uniting it with Arizona. The Senator from Connecticut continues:

The Territory of Dakota has by the Tenth Census 149,100 square miles, so that as one State it would embrace, in round numbers, 27,000 square miles more than the United Kingdom of England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales. It is practically as large as New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland, and Virginia. Just think—

Says the Senator from Connecticut—

Just think for a moment of putting those Territories into one State.

Here it is proposed to make one State out of these two Territories, which you see is more than half as large again.

The Senator from Connecticut further says:

Aside from the fact that it has no seacoast, it is as capable of supporting as large a population as those States.

It seems to me that when Senators seriously realize the area which this immense State (Dakota) would possess they can not but come to the conclusion that even if the sentiment of the people were adverse to it and the people had a dream of empire to grow out of the admission of such a great State, yet Congress, having reference to the physical equality of all the States, if I may use that term, ought not to think of admitting one State into the Union so capable of sustaining a dense population.

Now, Mr. President, this speech of Senator PLATT of Connecticut as to dividing the Dakotas into two States, because it was too large for one State, is stronger and more conclusive in favor of keeping apart New Mexico and Arizona than I could make, and I adopt it, although it comes from a Republican source. It is a stronger argument than I could make or anyone else, perhaps, in the Senate upon the very Territorial question which we are discussing. That was made upon Dakota, and Dakota, as I showed to you, contained more than half less the number of square miles than these two combined, and was but a little larger than New Mexico. New Mexico has 122,000 square miles and Arizona has 113,000 square miles. Both Lincoln Territory and South Dakota had only 149,000 square miles. What was then Lincoln Territory subsequently became North Dakota. So there was necessity there, and the Senator from Connecticut saw it and the whole country saw it, to divide its vast area into two States; to let them multiply the members of the Senate as often as they pleased. They were entitled to it and they got it; and I say these Territories are entitled to it and ought to have it.

Now, Mr. President, where did this territory come from to us? I do not care to go into the archaeological history of this remarkable country or allude to the prehistoric people who inhabited it. However seductive the sentimentality may be for some reference to the ancient cliff dwellers, I shall not indulge in it now.

I do not know how old it is, but the first we knew of it in connection with our country was after the Mexican war. It was won by the blood and treasure and lives of many of the best citizens who lived under the flag of our country.

Mr. President, it affords me pleasure to state to the eloquent young Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] that his ancestors and their friends, no doubt, stood by our flag along with Tennesseans to win this very territory. Gen. Joe Lane, of Indiana, commanded a brigade in that war, with Col. Jim Lane, of Indiana. Colonel Wynkoop, of Pennsylvania, and Colonel Cheatham, of Tennessee, at one time composed General Lane's brigade. Hard by were Ohioans, Kentuckians, and Illinoisans. It would be no invidious distinction nor out of place for me to say in this connection, as it is history, that Illinois furnished in the war with Mexico more soldiers than any other State, not excepting my own State of Tennessee—the Volunteer State. Illinois had only between one and two hundred more than Tennessee, out of several thousand each. Missouri, perhaps, raised more than any, but did not get them all in the active field before Mexico was overrun. So you see, Mr. President, this land over which this contest is so unjustifiably raised was won by a combined effort. We won it in battle; we won it by the blood and treasure of our common countrymen. It was a patriotic movement, and we are jointly entitled to the territory.

Yes, Mr. President, it was won fairly, honestly, and patriotically and it will remain as a part of this Government, and we ought to take care of it, and give it every opportunity and advantage which any other Territory has had. We should treat it generously and justly, and rise above party and local prejudice and mete out justice as to other Territories, and make a State there, so as to let them increase in power and usefulness.

It is in part the fruit of the bold and vigorous charge made

on the black fort at Monterey. It is alike the fruit of the bloody fighting amid the hills of Buena Vista, when General Taylor drove Santa Anna and his forces from the Rio Grande line. Another step toward the possession of this vast territory, over which we now dispute, was seen at Vera Cruz, when the guns of General Scott silenced the Mexican batteries. And again, when General Scott, that grand and grim old warrior, with his compact little army, confronted Santa Anna and his double-shotted cannon on the old bald hills of Cerro Gordo and drove him helter-skelter from this stronghold and followed him to the blood-stained lava beds of Contreras and Churubusco. The sun-bright plains of Molino del Rey were darkly stained with American blood. From there through the park at the base of Chapultepec was a thorny path, and when the charge up the hill of Chapultepec accomplished its object and the flag floated out from the white castle that sat upon the crown of Chapultepec as a tiara upon the crown of a queen, the halls of the Montezumas, with their romance and reality, were surrendered to the American Army. All this blood and toil helped to give title to the territory which is the cause of this unjust and unwise contention.

This was territory which came from those struggles, and we should respect it for the memory of them. We should do justice to it. They have become our people by virtue of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, and we should respect them. We should do justice to them and see that their Territory is made into a State.

Mr. President, Arizona will be an honor to this country whenever we give it an opportunity. Let the irrigation floods come and let those sandy plains be watered. Then you will see what it will produce. The result will astonish the country.

Furthermore, Mr. President, see the coal fields that are in Arizona. Look at the copper mines there—said to be superior to any in the world. It is said that there is more copper in Arizona than elsewhere in the world within the same extent of territory, and that it is of the finest quality. We have all that in this Territory. We have this great divide—in mountain form—and in them we have the canyons, in which we can make reservoirs from which to irrigate the plains and bring them out, making of it a wonderland. This is not only in the possibilities; it is in the probabilities; and I believe in a few years, if we deal justly with this Territory, this will be done.

But we can not do it if we hamper her and put her under the dominion of New Mexico, for this very bill gives power to New Mexico to hamper and neutralize the progress of Arizona. It gives her a majority in her constitutional convention, and that will give New Mexico a majority in her legislature. She may legislate selfishly or not; I do not know; but at least it gives a majority strength over Arizona.

So she has more coal, more copper ore, and then she has more qualities to produce grass and fat cattle that graze upon her hundred hills, and, besides all that, I wish to emphasize the fact that the hand of nature divides her. Nature planted those mountains there—the Continental Divide. The lowest point which divides this mountain range is 4,800 feet. The waters from one side run to the Atlantic and from the other to the Pacific. Nature did all that, and you are doing violence to nature whenever you seek to force these two Territories together to intermarry these parties and fasten them like the Siamese twins, so that the death of one will be the death of the other, for the legal ligament by which this bill seeks to join them could not be cut. It fastens them for life—no divorce can separate them. These mountains divide them. Nature planted them there, and do not let us refuse to obey the indication of nature or disdain her teaching in legislating for these Territories.

Mr. President, there are some amendments to this bill. I decline, however, to discuss those amendments now, and for the very sufficient reason that the Senators who introduced the amendments have not been heard from in regard to them, and I do not want to pass judgment upon an amendment offered by anyone to this bill until I shall hear the reasons for it. Therefore I can only allude to the fact that there are amendments to it—one by my friend over there from California [Mr. BARD], whose speech captured the Senate the other day as much as I have seen one do, with his modest merit and his plain statements of facts and arguments, which added to his justly earned reputation.

Another amendment has been offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER], which nobody can possibly object to at the proper time when it comes in. It leaves the voice of the people to regulate this question. It is a home-rule amendment. I am not going to discuss it. Then there is the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], who has an amendment that is full of merit, in my opinion, but I decline to discuss it, because he desires to say something in regard to it himself before we have any action

touching it. Then, again, there is an amendment by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PATTERSON], which is full of merit. You can see it. I want to hear him discuss it before we pass judgment upon it. Then there is the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], which admits Oklahoma, the State which has sprung up in so short a time, like magic.

Ah, Mr. President, Oklahoma is almost equal to California. There it is now with its half a million people, and probably the Indian Territory has half a million people. I do not know what course you may take about that; I for one do not believe in putting Indian Territory in with it, for reasons that I propose to give later on in this discussion.

I hope that which is thought best by a majority of the Senate will be done in this important matter. These States might jump into statehood as California did, if I may so speak; for California, as Senators will remember, jumped into statehood as a roe bounds before the hunter in the darksome glade or the shadowy forests. California came in with her Sacramento and San Joaquin valleys and her Forty-niners and claimed statehood without ceremony, and got it. And, Mr. President, when she did come with her broad coast-line territory and her Golden Gate, she brought with her apples of gold on platters of silver from Nevada; and on that silver platter of Nevada she emptied her golden apples into the Treasury of the United States without fee or asking for it. California, I repeat, sprang into statehood, as Minerva sprang from the brain of Jove, full panoplied, and found a warm welcome and a safe home in the Union; and so ought these other Territories without going through the usual slow process of years to which they have been subjected. But they have seen fit to take this course and have appealed in a legal and modest way to the country—to the House of Representatives first and then to the Senate; and I hope the Senate will give such a response as will be just to all parties and in the end give a warm welcome to each of these Territories as a sister State.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, I think this an opportune time to direct the attention of Senators who are opposed to the bill to the fact that a time for voting might now be fixed upon, which would give an opportunity to the Senators whom the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BATE] stated desire yet to be heard, and have a time fixed for voting after they are heard. I assume that will be—

Mr. BATE. I did not hear the latter part of the Senator's remark in regard to fixing a time for Senators to be heard.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I say that the Senator from Tennessee adverted to the fact, in closing his very able, eloquent, and interesting address, that there are other Senators who desire to be heard. I take it for granted, in view of what has passed both in open Senate and between Senators and myself privately, that now is an opportune time to fix a date at some future time when a vote may be had—a sufficient time ahead to give an opportunity to the Senators whom the Senator from Tennessee mentioned, and others who may desire to speak, to be heard upon the bill. I suggest to the Senator that perhaps next Friday would be a good day, and there would be sufficient time intervene—

Mr. TELLER. Oh, no.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I refer to this coming Friday.

Mr. TELLER. Oh, no.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am not particular about that date. I have suggested that date because the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] is going away on the following day, and he desires to be present when the vote is taken. I suggest either that day or a week later. I am not particular.

Mr. CARMACK. I suggest to the Senator that it is contrary to precedent to fix a day for a vote on the statehood bill.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Well, I want to know whether the Senator from Tennessee approves of the precedent to which he refers, and whether he expects to follow it?

Mr. CARMACK. I do.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is the very first assurance of that kind I have had, for I have been privately assured, and have been acting upon the understanding, I will say—and the Senator will bear me out—both in private conversation and in open Senate, that after a reasonable discussion there would be no objection to fixing a date on which the final vote might be taken. I, of course, am not particular about any special date.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, inasmuch as the Senator from Indiana has made reference to the fact that I am going away, and ask some favors in this matter, I rise to say that I do have to go out of the city the last of the week—perhaps Saturday—and shall be gone about a week.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] objected to fixing Friday.

Mr. FORAKER. I think I can be back for a vote on Friday of next week.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That will be satisfactory to me, if it be satisfactory to other Senators.

Mr. FORAKER. I think Saturday would suit me a little better.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Say a week from Saturday, then.

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President, I do not believe that we can now fix a day for a final vote on this bill. I recognize the anxiety of the young Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] to get rid of what must be a burden to him. He has conducted this case very ably so far, and devoted a great deal of energy and assiduity to it, but we are about, as I understand, to resolve ourselves into an impeachment court. I have heard to-day that the House managers will appear to-morrow, and then I suppose the Senate will immediately take some order as to procedure. When that court is organized, I do not suppose the Senate will interrupt its judicial functions to hear any more legislative discussion until it has concluded that matter.

I recollect but one impeachment trial, and that was in the second term of President Grant. The President pro tempore of the Senate [Mr. FRYE] was then a Member of the House of Representatives, as was also the other Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], and some who are now here were members of the Senate at that time, and will remember, but I do not recall exactly what was then done. My impression, however, is that after the managers of the House of Representatives had moved the impeachment the Senate proceeded to the hearing, and that it was not interrupted by any other business. I presume the coming impeachment trial will have to be interrupted by the counting of the electoral votes for President and Vice-President of the United States. In view of the probable situation, I simply suggest to the Senator from Indiana that it would be risky to fix a date for voting on the pending bill; for we might have to fix another date, and then another. I think we might just as well await the progress of events.

I will say, besides, that there are some gentlemen who, being interested in this question, may desire to be heard, and I am one of them. I have become so much interested in it that I think it very likely that I myself shall make a few appropriate remarks. I do not know how many more are in that condition of mind. I can not say when I shall be able to speak. I do not know but that I am interfering in this matter, not being a member of the committee. I hope not, however. I do not know that the other side are particularly serious about the passage of this measure. I do not know whether they intend to do anything or not at this session or at any other regarding it; but I do not doubt the sincerity of the Senator in charge of the measure in pressing it.

In view of all these circumstances, I hope the Senator from Indiana will not insist on fixing the time now. Let us see what we are going to do with the impeachment case; and then it will be time enough, I think, to consider the fixing of a positive date to vote on this important matter.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, the Senate has not been favored with the presence of my distinguished friend from Mississippi very much since the holidays, or I am sure he would not have said that I had shown any particular earnestness or haste in pressing this measure. For that there was a reason. Senators have expressed to me privately their appreciation of the courtesy shown them by doing whatever was required from time to time, by adjourning, going into executive session, and even occupying time ourselves, which, I will say to the Senator from Mississippi, was done upon the personal assurance of Senators active in charge of the opposition to the bill that after a reasonable discussion, expecting to come to a vote this session, they would agree upon the fixing of a date. I accepted that assurance from several Senators, who gave it to me personally. The Senator will remember—the whole Senate will remember—that the same assurance was publicly given by the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN], who is universally recognized as the leader on that side upon the floor of the Senate. Accepting these assurances without a single question that they would be kept—and I have no doubt that they will be—I will say to the Senator that at no time has the bill been unduly pressed.

Mr. MONEY. The Senator will allow me to say right there that in the language I used I intended to be complimentary to him on account of his character and industry and energy, and that I did not intend to say, and did not say, that he had been in haste or anything of the sort.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am obliged to the Senator.

Mr. MONEY. I only mentioned the fact simply because I have been unfortunate in having been sick myself and in having sickness in my family. I came here without much infor-

mation about the matter. I freely acknowledge that. I have not intimated yet, nor do I intend to do so, that the Senator has failed in any courtesy to this side of the House, but I say that I am totally uninformed as to any private agreement that might have been entered into, and I will yield if the Senator says that is the case, to the leader of the Senate on this side, and leave to him entirely the fixing of a date. I only objected in my own behalf. So far as I am concerned personally, I am entirely willing to forego making any speech on the subject. I am not particular about that at all.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I shall be delighted to hear the Senator make a speech, as not only myself but all other Senators always are. I was merely taking this method of informing the Senator of occurrences of which I was sure he was in ignorance, they having transpired during his absence. I think the Senator will find that the disposition upon his side of the Chamber, as well as upon this side of the Chamber, is that there shall be no special delay about coming to a vote.

It was suggested when we last had this subject up—and since then I have not asked that a date be fixed—as I think the RECORD will show, that after a few days of discussion, when Senators shall have had an opportunity of presenting their arguments, and the arguments are before the Senate—I think now every argument has been presented that can be presented, unless perhaps the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] has some arguments with reference to his amendment—we could all get together and agree upon a day for a vote. I say that has been the universal understanding, expressed to me not only privately, but also publicly by the leader on the other side of the Chamber. I have acted in full faith upon that assurance, and therefore have not held the bill before the Senate unreasonably, as I think all Senators will agree, an appreciation of which fact they have personally expressed to me.

Now, I say to the Senator from Mississippi that I informed him of these facts, which he states he was ignorant of and which I was sure he was ignorant of, in order that the general understanding might be carried out. I am not now particularly importunate about any special date. I would not shut off any Senator from a reasonable discussion of this or any other measure. But the measure has now been discussed at considerable length upon one side; there has been only one speech made upon the other side, and perhaps will be but one more, and that a very brief one in closing the debate. Therefore it occurred to me, in view of what the Senator from Maryland had stated when we last had this subject up, that after a few days of discussion had been had we could agree upon a day for a vote. I suggested next Friday because the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] had said that upon the day following he must leave to make an argument before a Federal court and would not return for a week, and he suggested that the vote be taken on the following Saturday. That would leave two weeks during which speeches could be made by Senators who wanted to speak without interfering with the impeachment proceedings in case they should be perfected.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana states that he understood from me that an early day would be fixed to vote upon this bill. I think if he will refer to the RECORD he will find that what I said was this: That so far as I knew, there was no desire to unduly delay this bill, and that when the time arrived—as it always does arrive in the Senate—we would be prepared to vote, and so far as I knew we should be very glad to do so; but, Mr. President, I have stated to the Senator from Indiana in private, and I now say to the Senate, that, in my judgment, this is a case that does not come under the ordinary rule of fixing arbitrarily a day for the final vote on a measure until we shall have had opportunity to vote upon the amendments to it. When a day and hour is fixed for voting, it precludes the possibility of the discussion of important propositions that go to the very vitals of a question.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. May I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. GORMAN. If the Senator will permit me to finish the sentence, I will then give way to him with great pleasure.

I think there is as great anxiety on this side of the Chamber as there can be on the other side of the Chamber for the admission into the Union of Oklahoma and Indian Territory, singly or combined, and for the admission of New Mexico; but, from the discussion and from statements made on both sides, there seems to be very great opposition to uniting New Mexico and Arizona. There is no possible political phase that affects the proposition to admit Indian Territory and Oklahoma and New Mexico, leaving Arizona out of the question.

Now, in that condition, Mr. President, with a view to reaching some proper conclusion in this matter, I suggest to the Senator from Indiana that we take up and vote upon the amendment of the Senator from California [Mr. BARD], the amend-

ment offered by the distinguished Senator from Colorado to my right [Mr. PATTERSON], that of the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] in my rear, and that of the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER]. Each of those amendments will require discussion, but not unlimited discussion. My belief is that in this way we shall soon test the real sense of the Senate, so that we may know and will know after the votes on these amendments are had what the majority of the Senate desire. As soon as that is ascertained, the rule which has always applied, except upon some great political question—and this is not one—will bring us to a direct vote. Until we arrive at that conclusion, I think it is impossible to fix a time for the final vote on the bill.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. GORMAN. With great pleasure.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Can not the sense of the majority of the Senate be determined when we fix a day to vote, and vote on that day on the bill and amendments?

Mr. GORMAN. I think not, for the very reason I have already given.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. What was the Senator's reason?

Mr. GORMAN. Because the amendments can not then be discussed freely.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is the question I rose to ask the Senator in the first place. The Senator from Maryland suggested that the reason that could not be done fairly was because it would preclude the possibility of discussing proposed amendments. I will ask the Senator if we should fix the later date suggested by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER], whether in that interim every amendment offered to this bill could not be thoroughly discussed? There would be abundant time to discuss the amendments. We are told by the Senator himself that the bill itself has been discussed at considerable length. Is not that true? Is there any reason why these amendments should not be discussed if we fix the date at two weeks from now, as the Senator from Ohio has suggested?

Mr. GORMAN. The result of an agreement of that kind would probably be to preclude the real discussion of the amendments.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That would only be, I suggest to the Senator, in case the Senators who have proposed amendments do not desire to speak on them. That is within their own power, is it not?

Mr. GORMAN. I suggest to the Senator, if he wants to expedite this matter—and I am as anxious about it as he can possibly be—all the committee amendments, as I understand, having been concluded, that we shall at once proceed to take up and debate, for instance, the amendment of the Senator from Colorado to my right [Mr. PATTERSON], and I am quite certain that we can very soon reach the point where we can have a vote on that amendment and dispose of it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator would not make a request of that kind before the debate had been concluded by the chairman or some member of the committee in charge of the bill who resists the amendment, would he? I have been delaying until the debate is concluded, upon the assurance, which, I repeat, has been given me privately and publicly, that after a discussion of some days a time for a vote would be fixed. Therefore, not only have I not interfered, but I have consented to adjournments and executive sessions, and even occupied the time myself for two or three days upon committee amendments. Now the Senator suggests, with much of the debate on his side concluded and the debate not finished at all upon our side—for there has been but one speech made on behalf of the advocates of the bill—that we immediately proceed to vote upon the amendments. Certainly the Senator would not suggest that. That would be hardly fair to the committee, would it?

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, I would, of course, be the last Senator in this body to suggest that we proceed to vote on the amendments before the Senator from Indiana and members of the committee on the other side, who favor the proposition for the admission of two States out of four Territories, should have opportunity to make speeches; but I suggest to him that the opportune time will come upon the amendment offered, for instance, by the Senator from Colorado, which goes to the very vitals of the bill of the committee. That amendment provides for the admission of two States, leaving Arizona out.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Does the Senator suggest that we proceed right now to take up that amendment?

Mr. GORMAN. The Senator could make his argument on that amendment. The question revolves around that proposition, and, in a lesser degree, around the proposition of the Senator from Ohio, which might be accepted if the amendment of the Senator from Colorado were rejected. While some of us—and I for one—regard the amendments of the Senator from

Ohio as a very bad precedent, yet, to prevent what seems in our opinion a great misfortune—the adoption of the proposition to consolidate the two Territories—it would receive a very large vote. It would receive mine, although as an original proposition and standing alone I would not like it.

So I suggest again to the Senator, with these various opinions utterly impossible to be harmonized except by a vote in the determination of the Senate, that the only way, in my judgment, to reach a conclusion is for the Senator to proceed to sum up his case from his standpoint and let us have a vote on one of these amendments which is the very opposite of the bill reported by the committee.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Very well. I will say again to the Senator that I have been proceeding in perfect good faith that certain speeches would be made, and when they had been made a day for a vote on the bill would be fixed; and that, as is usual, and, so far as I have observed in my brief term in the Senate, an unbroken precedent, the chairman of the committee, having heard all of the speeches or read them all, should proceed to close the debate. That is what I had expected to do. I have been informed that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] desires to speak, and the Senator will do me the justice of saying that I myself protected the Senator from Colorado when he was ill upon the ground that he was going to speak. I have been informed that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] desires to speak. I have not yet read, and was not fortunate in hearing, all of the very able speech of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BATE], the close of which so charmed us all. When all these speeches, which I had been personally informed were going to be made, had been made, I expected without much delay to prepare what brief remarks I might have in summing up this case. The delivery of those speeches I supposed would probably take this week.

I say that I have gone upon that assurance; otherwise I should be ready to proceed now. That, I see from the Senator's attitude as I make these remarks, is agreeable to his own understanding. That being the case, in view of the Senator's suggestion, why would this not be a reasonable solution: Let us agree on, say, next Saturday, to vote, for example, on the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, to which the Senator from Maryland referred, and then the week following, when the Senator from Ohio shall have returned, vote on other amendments and on the bill. In the meantime any Senator can make a speech, and the chairman of the committee, or some Senator for the committee, can briefly sum up the case. Is there objection to that?

Mr. MONEY. Mr. President, when I rose to make objection, which I did, to fixing a day certain and an hour certain for the final vote on this measure, I was not aware that any Senator on this side had been invested with power to speak for his colleagues, nor did I know until I was kindly informed by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] that any such assurance had been given by anybody. I immediately retreated from my position, though, when I found the matter was in the hands of the leader of the Democratic side. Since then, however, I have found that there has been no conference in regard to the matter, and that nobody has been authorized to speak for this side of the House. I can find nobody who gave any assurance to the Senator from Indiana—of course I do not doubt his word that he had such an assurance—but I can not find the Senator who gave it, and the leader of the minority says the Senator from Indiana certainly misunderstood him. So I do not know how this assurance came to the Senator from Indiana; but I want to say in my own behalf, in vindication of my temerity in undertaking to file an objection—a thing which every Senator has a right to do on his own motion without consulting anybody—that I did so, not from any desire to delay the bill, for I have not kept up with it, but because I understand from good authority that we are about to enter upon the Swayne impeachment trial. I think the Senator from Indiana will agree that during the consideration of that case it may not occur to anybody to make a speech on this or any other question.

Mr. President, I do not yet understand how we can fix a day certain for a vote upon this bill, when everybody here is aware that we are about to enter upon an impeachment trial. Nobody here can say what length of time may be taken in that trial. It would hardly do for the Senate to adjourn before the trial had been concluded, because the new House of Representatives will not have managers authorized to conduct the case. The Senate can continue as a court, because it is a continuing body, but the House would have no managers in the next Congress and the case would fall to the ground. So we must continue the work if we undertake it. If it is the determination of the other side of the House to exculpate the impeached judge, we can have a very short procedure; but I do not believe that is exactly the inten-

tion. I think we want to get at the bottom of the facts in the case and then vote accordingly. So I must say, while my objection may seem rather slight to the Senator from Indiana, that there is a good deal in it, and we can not very well fix a day until some one can authoritatively, in some degree, state when that court is likely to terminate its functions and when we shall resolve ourselves back into a legislative body.

As I said, I should like to speak briefly on this bill, not because it is a matter that needs any elucidation or information from me, but simply because I have been largely in correspondence with and have visited both Arizona and New Mexico, and I have some things to say about them. I want to say that I disagree with some of my Democratic friends, as I understand them. I shall never vote to have any one of the Territories united with another.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is all right.

Mr. MONEY. I am perfectly willing to have any one of these Territories come in separately. I have respect for the moral obligation of a treaty, and our obligation with the Indians is that they shall never be joined with any other State. It is said that that expires this year; but a moral obligation never expires, and it is just as good fifty years from now as it is to-day. But so many white people have gone to the Indian Territory—about a half million—that they are perfectly competent now—the white men, excluding every Indian—to undertake the care and burden of self-government, and a Territory is such an anomaly in the whole theory of our Government that I am willing to hasten the day when we admit every one of them.

I recollect very well when, as a Member of the House, I insisted, when the Democrats had control there, that the new chairman should introduce a bill admitting every Territory, without regard to its politics or anything else, in order to rid the country of its wardship of a great section of the country fully able to take care of itself.

I share fully the opinions set forth by the eloquent Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BATE] to-day, but I have something more to say upon the subject myself. I am not going to stand in the way of fixing a day, for I do not care anything about it; but I wanted at least to say that I have some rights in this matter, and that when I took the floor it was not with any assumed authority from this side, but in my own right, as a Senator, to make an objection if I saw fit.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, I had not intended to say anything with reference to the proposition to fix a day for voting on this bill, but as some allusion has been made to the fact that the Senate will have to consume some considerable time in the impeachment trial which has been brought to our attention by the House, I desire to say that that to my mind furnishes an almost imperative reason why we should fix an early day for voting upon this bill, and I trust that Senators who are opposed to certain features of the bill will consider the necessity, growing out of the fact that the Senate must devote time to this impeachment trial, of getting this bill out of the way before that really commences.

I assume that Senators do not wish, by any delay or postponement of the time for fixing a vote on this bill, to prevent the bill from being acted upon at this session. I assume that all Senators desire to have this bill acted upon, it having been so long before the Senate and so thoroughly and ably discussed.

Now, as to the time when the Senate will have to commence actually the hearing of the trial upon the impeachment case, it is impossible to say. That is for the Senate to fix. The natural order of proceedings will be that probably on to-morrow the managers from the House will come and present the articles of impeachment. The rules provide that on the next day, or sooner if the Senate so desires, the Senators shall be sworn to try the case, and to all intents and purposes what may be called a court of impeachment be organized. I think, with a view of expediting the matter, that that ought to be done to-morrow, after the managers of the impeachment shall have presented the articles.

Then the next step is to issue a summons to the person impeached to appear. The Senate will have to decide what time shall be fixed for his appearance, and until that day occurs, of course, the legislative business of the Senate will not be interfered with. Then at that time he will appear, and, following the usual precedent, will ask for some time to be fixed within which he may file his answer, and that will be agreed upon, I take it. So that until that time arrives legislative business will not to any considerable extent be interfered with in the Senate. But after that the usual practice has been to designate certain hours during which the Senate should sit in the impeachment proceedings, and during the other hours of the day legislative or executive business would proceed as usual. It is manifest that we shall have to hasten with all possible and practical speed, without doing any injustice to anyone, the proceedings in

the impeachment trial. Having said this much, it does seem to me that Senators on both sides of the Chamber ought to look to the result of getting this bill entirely out of the way before the judge impeached shall come here and file his answer and the actual trial begin. I make these suggestions merely because the matter had been alluded to by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY].

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, it is manifest to my mind from what has been said here that there can not be any agreement on a day to take a vote on this bill and all amendments until some of the amendments which have been offered have been disposed of. I am somewhat taken by surprise by this situation, but that is what has developed.

I think everyone recognizes that the difficulty as to this measure is chiefly with respect to the provisions of the bill in relation to New Mexico and Arizona, providing joint statehood instead of separate statehood. There are some amendments here to strike out all about New Mexico and Arizona, and two or three amendments, I believe, providing for separate statehood for New Mexico; and there is the amendment which I offered a few days ago providing that if this bill pass and become a law there shall be a majority vote in each of the Territories upon the question of adopting the constitution that is to be framed; failing in a majority vote in each Territory the whole proceedings fall to the ground.

In view of what has developed here, I have concluded to offer an amendment, and I shall take advantage of an early opportunity to speak briefly in support of it, and then I will ask, as soon as we can agree upon it, for a vote on that amendment. The amendment I shall now offer and do offer—I send it to the desk for that purpose—is to strike out all in the present bill referring to New Mexico and Arizona, and providing for separate statehood for both New Mexico and Arizona.

Mr. CLAY. I will ask the Senator from Ohio whether it is not true that an amendment of that kind is pending?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes.

Mr. FORAKER. There is not an amendment, as I understand it—

Mr. CLAY. There is.

Mr. FORAKER. Providing separate statehood as to both Territories and substituting—

Mr. CLAY. I will say to the Senator that there is an amendment pending and printed that strikes out all the provisions of this bill relating to Arizona and New Mexico and inserts separate statehood for Arizona and New Mexico, and substituting the bill—

Mr. FORAKER. I was not aware of that.

Mr. CLAY. And substituting the bill which passed the House and was pending in the Senate during the last session.

Mr. FORAKER. I was not aware that anyone had offered that particular amendment. I offer it and ask—

Mr. CLAY. I will say to the Senator that I prepared it at his instance.

Mr. FORAKER. Very well. I will ask that this amendment be printed and laid on the table, in order that it may be compared with the other, to determine whether there are any differences between them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). The amendment will be received and printed.

Mr. FORAKER. I have no extended speech to make. I wish to say something in behalf of the amendment. I think we ought to try to reach a point where we can give statehood to Oklahoma and the Indian Territory. I do not think there ought to be any objection to that. I think it would be very unfortunate if there should be; and I do not think we will ever get a vote on that proposition until we take a vote on the other.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President, I do not wish to be misunderstood as to what I said in my colloquy with my friend the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE] a few moments ago. I did not mean to say that I was unalterably opposed to fixing a day for a vote. I only meant to say that I am opposed to fixing a day until after we have had a reasonable time for debate. As to what constitutes a reasonable time for debate on the statehood bill of course will have to be governed by precedents.

Mr. BEVERIDGE obtained the floor.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Was the Senator from Colorado going to address the Senate on the matter under discussion?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will withhold, then, until the Senator from Colorado gets through.

Mr. PATTERSON. It pertains to the general matter that was under discussion.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. If that is true, I yield. Otherwise I was going to make a request.

Mr. PATTERSON. It is not a foreign matter.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator, I take it, is not going to make a speech to-night?

Mr. PATTERSON. Oh, no; I am about through.

Mr. President, it has been stated that there is no amendment to the statehood bill now pending. I offer an amendment which I had printed a few days ago, and I ask that a vote be taken on that amendment. I will state briefly what the amendment is.

It eliminates from the bill as reported by the Committee on Territories all that pertains to New Mexico and Arizona as a State, leaving, as the bill was reported from the committee, all that relates to the joining of Oklahoma and Indian Territory as a State. In lieu of the part that is proposed to be stricken out, the part that relates to the joinder of New Mexico and Arizona, I have, following the phraseology of the bill and carefully retaining all the provisions that were applicable, made the amendment provide for the admission of New Mexico alone, applying to New Mexico all the provisions that were applicable to the joint bill, but so changing them as to make them applicable to New Mexico alone. So the amendment, if adopted, would make the bill stand as it was reported from the Committee on Territories, except to provide for the admission of Oklahoma and the Indian Territory as one State and the admission of New Mexico as another, leaving Arizona out of the bill at this time altogether.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I take it the Senator from Colorado did not hear the colloquy between the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] and myself. I stated to the Senator from Maryland that in view of the fact that I had been expecting, relying upon assurances that there were certain speeches to be made, to close the debate, or that some person, on behalf of the committee would, before any vote was taken, he would hardly expect to offer that or any other amendment before the chairman or some person in behalf of the committee had closed the debate, to which of course the Senator from Maryland by a nod of the head instantly assented. I take it the Senator from Colorado did not hear the colloquy between us.

Mr. PATTERSON. Let me say—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Colorado to the fact that it is not in order to offer his amendment for action at this time.

Mr. PATTERSON. I do not understand the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator from Colorado intends to offer the amendment for action at this time, it is not in order.

Mr. BERRY. Why?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Because there are pending an amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FORAKER] and a reserved amendment by the committee.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. In any event, point of order or no point of order, but going to the root of the matter, I say I take it the Senator from Colorado could not have heard the colloquy between the Senator from Maryland and myself about this very matter.

Mr. PATTERSON. Let me—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Of course the Senator would not expect any vote to be had until we had closed the debate or had an opportunity to do so. I repeat that I had expected to close the debate at the end of the week, upon the assurance that this week would be taken up by speeches which I expected would be made by various Senators.

The Senator from Colorado has been away most of the session, I will say to the Senate. In the conduct of this bill from day to day, I have acceded to every request that was made of me by Senators on either side opposed to the bill, upon the understanding repeatedly made that when the bill had been reasonably and in good faith debated a day for voting would be fixed.

Now, it has been stated, even to-day, that there are several speeches to be made. After these are made I expect to close the debate, and the Senator would hardly offer his amendments in view of that.

Mr. PATTERSON. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am sure the Senator did not hear the colloquy.

Mr. PATTERSON. As a matter of course, I had not the slightest idea that the Senator from Indiana would be prevented from making the speech which we are all anxious to hear.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am sure you must be.

Mr. PATTERSON. It undoubtedly will be filled with everything that is interesting and essential to a proper understanding of the entire question. By the way, I want to suggest to the honorable Presiding Officer that I was not aware that when a bill is up, even for discussion, the offering of an amendment is not in order at any time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not so state.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I assume—

Mr. PATTERSON. Just one moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not so state.

Mr. PATTERSON. It was my misfortune to understand the Chair in that way.

I want to ask the Senator from Indiana whether he is willing to fix a time for taking a vote upon this amendment of mine?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes. I will say to the Senator from Colorado that he has not been paying attention to the proceedings. I suggested that very thing, and not only that, but when the Senator rose I had risen and was about to make a request for unanimous consent that on next Friday or on next Monday we vote upon the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, and that on the following Saturday, to wit, one week from next Saturday, we vote upon the bill and all other amendments.

Mr. PATTERSON. It must be obvious to the Senator from Indiana that there are very serious objections, which have been urged by Senators upon this side of the House, against now fixing a time for voting upon the bill and amendments.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Why?

Mr. PATTERSON. The Senator was mistaken when he suggested that I had not been paying attention, for I have been.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I did not mean it in any unkind way.

Mr. PATTERSON. Oh, no. It is all right.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator did hear me suggest that we vote on his amendment next Friday?

Mr. PATTERSON. If the Senator from Indiana will agree that my amendment shall be voted upon next Friday, which is a simple proposition entirely disconnected from other matters—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It is a simple proposition.

Mr. PATTERSON. I have not any question that it will be accepted.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Not only that, but I now make the request for unanimous consent that on next Friday at 4 o'clock in the afternoon we shall vote upon the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, and that upon the following Saturday week we shall vote upon the bill and other amendments.

Mr. PATTERSON. The motion of the Senator from Indiana is divisible.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No; I do not make a motion. I make a request.

Mr. PATTERSON. Well, the request of the Senator from Indiana is divisible. I am interested in having him agree to a vote upon my amendment disconnected from all other propositions—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am, too; but—

Mr. PATTERSON. On next Friday.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. We are, of course, trying to arrive at a common conclusion. We are not parrying. This debate thus far has not been carried on in that spirit. We are getting to a common conclusion, a conclusion we have all agreed should be reached. I am willing to oblige the Senator from Colorado. The suggestion he makes originated with me. Let us vote upon the Senator's amendment, and then a week afterwards, when the Senator from Ohio shall have returned—and that is the reason why I fixed a week afterwards, because he will be away during that week—let us vote upon the bill and his amendments.

Now, why should the Senator—I put it to him in entire good faith; this is no sparring—insist upon a time being fixed for a vote upon his amendment and not be willing to fix a time for voting on the bill to which the amendment is offered, in view of the fact that the bill itself has been thoroughly discussed, and that, in the meantime, between now and Friday, the Senator himself can amply discuss his amendment.

Mr. PATTERSON. The Senator from Indiana very clearly has not been paying attention to what I have been saying.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That may be clear to the Senator.

Mr. PATTERSON. Or, very clearly, he did not apprehend what I was saying.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That may possibly be.

Mr. PATTERSON. I suppose, if the latter is the case, it is owing to my lack of ability to express myself.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Not at all.

Mr. PATTERSON. My proposition clearly and unqualifiedly was that, independent of every other proposition, a day should be fixed for voting upon my amendment.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; I heard the Senator. I comprehended even that from the Senator.

Mr. PATTERSON. And immediately the Senator from Indiana—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No. Let the Senator go ahead. I do not ask him to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. PATTERSON. And immediately the Senator from Indiana says, "Yes; of course we will agree to the proposition of the Senator from Colorado," and then he proceeds to restate it, but tacks on an amendment of his own which has no relation or connection with the proposition I made.

Let us have an understanding with the Senator from Indiana, clear and distinct, upon my proposition. Will he now agree to fix a day for voting upon my amendment, disconnected from any other agreement or proposition?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Most certainly the Senator does not expect me to agree to any such thing. I have the right to ask the Senator why he makes such a proposition. I want to say to the Senator that he has been absent or he would not make such a proposition. I state again and with earnestness that the whole conduct of this bill has been upon the definite assurance of Senators upon the other side that they wanted to make some speeches, and after those speeches were made they would be willing to fix a day for voting on the bill at this session. The speeches thus far made have consumed three weeks upon the bill itself.

Now the Senator from Colorado proposes an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that his amendment shall be voted on next Friday, during which time he can enlighten the Senate upon his amendment, and that in the week following, when the Senator from Ohio shall have returned, we shall vote upon the bill itself, which I have been assured by Senators in active management of the opposition to the bill would be done before this session closes. Why does the Senator from Colorado ask the Senate to vote upon the amendment alone and not on the bill, which has been under discussion and which I have been assured, and we have all been assured, would be voted upon at this session? I will say to the Senator that if he had been here during the afternoon, since I made the request, he would have heard it repeatedly stated and agreed to by Senators on the other side that the conduct of this debate upon the part of those of us who favor the bill has been with that understanding. From day to day we have adjourned. Any request that has been made by any person in opposition to the bill has been immediately acceded to upon the understanding and upon the assurance directly given that a vote would be had. Otherwise the Senator knows perfectly well I would have held the bill before the Senate from 2 o'clock until 5 o'clock every day. The Senator has been away and does not know that, of course, or I am sure he would not have made the request. In order to solve this whole problem I ask unanimous consent that on next Friday at 4 o'clock we vote upon the amendment of the Senator from Colorado, and that on the following Saturday week, when the Senator from Ohio shall have returned, we vote upon the bill and all other amendments, beginning at 2 o'clock.

Mr. BARD. Mr. President, I desire to ask whether it is in order now to offer an amendment to the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendments can be offered at any time.

Mr. BARD. I supposed so. I desire to offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. BARD. Mr. President, in this connection I desire to say in reference to fixing a time for voting upon any other amendment that I believe the most logical way of ascertaining the will of the Senate will be to take up first this amendment. It is practically for a division of the bill. It disposes of the latter part of the bill, and there remains but one proposition—the admission of the new State of Oklahoma. The bill would then be open for any further amendment. I would therefore prefer very much to have this amendment discussed and disposed of first.

Mr. McCUMBER obtained the floor.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will say to the Senator from California—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. McCUMBER. I yield.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I beg the Senator's pardon. I did not observe that the Senator had addressed the Chair. The Senator from North Dakota may proceed. I was merely going to explain a matter to the Senator from California.

Mr. McCUMBER. I only want to say very briefly that there are several amendments to this bill. Some amendments provide for statehood for New Mexico separately and for Arizona separately; some for the Indian Territory and Oklahoma separately. In order to vote intelligently upon any one of these amendments, each and every one ought to be discussed.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is true.

Mr. McCUMBER. I for one shall object to any single

amendment being taken up and voted on at any given time without the consideration of all the other amendments, and then another day being fixed for voting on the bill. I feel that all of these amendments are introduced in good faith—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes.

Mr. McCUMBER. And they ought to have consideration and they ought all to be debated.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I think the remarks of both the Senator from North Dakota and the Senator from California are very much to the point, and I wish to say to both Senators that I made my request with reference to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado in response to the suggestion of the Senator from Maryland. The Senator from Maryland suggested that, and being willing to adopt any reasonable method that would solve this question and meet as nearly as might be the desires and views of all the Senators, I merely adopted the suggestion that on next Friday we should vote upon it. But possibly that might be modified. I do not know but that logically the amendment of the Senator from California might come first. That is immaterial. It might be modified in this way. That beginning on next Friday at 4 o'clock we vote on the amendment of the Senator from Colorado or the amendment of the Senator from California—I do not care which—and then, to meet the further suggestion just made by the Senator from North Dakota, that we continue to vote from day to day, as the amendments may be discussed, upon other amendments to the bill until the following Saturday week, at which time we shall vote upon the bill and all amendments that have not in the meantime been discussed and disposed of.

The effect of that would be that on next Friday at 4 o'clock we would vote upon whatever we might agree to be the first amendment, and then immediately, from day to day, vote upon succeeding amendments as they come up until the following Saturday week—that would be eight days—at which time the bill itself and all remaining amendments would be voted upon. I modify my request in that way. I think that meets the view of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. McCUMBER. I see nothing in the condition of this bill that would justify the assumption that it is necessary to fix two separate days for voting.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No, the Senator—

Mr. McCUMBER. I can not see—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator excuse me?

Mr. McCUMBER. Just a moment. I can not see why, if we agree upon a day to vote upon the bill, we can not also agree on a day to vote on all amendments, and following those amendments with the vote on the bill. So far as I am concerned personally, I should like to see that done.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. All right.

Mr. McCUMBER. I admit that I favor four separate States out of those Territories. I should like to see that question voted upon. I should like to have time for its consideration.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. All right.

Mr. McCUMBER. If we take up any of these amendments it seems to me that by next Friday we will not have time to consider the several amendments and give opportunity for every Senator to express himself not only upon the amendment in which he may be interested, but upon every other amendment. It seems to me that in two weeks, say, a week from next Friday, we could probably practically exhaust the subject so far as its discussion will be necessary in the Senate, and I for one should like to see the vote taken at that time or shortly after that time, but I must object to any one amendment being taken up and fixed to be voted upon prior to the time of the vote upon the bill.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, I am perfectly agreeable to the suggestion of the Senator from North Dakota. I merely made the other to meet the views of other Senators. I understand that the Senator from North Dakota will object to any time being fixed for a separate vote on amendments, and that matter must go on in the meantime to be discussed by those who have speeches to make upon the subject. I will not further urge my request for a day to be fixed either as to amendments or the bill.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. At the suggestion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], and following the thought of the Senator from North Dakota, I ask unanimous consent that on one week from next Saturday, at 2 o'clock, the bill and all amendments shall be voted upon.

Mr. GALLINGER. Amendments pending and to be offered.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Amendments pending now and to be offered.

Mr. GALLINGER. Amendments then pending.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That will give two weeks.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, I want to congratulate the

Senator from Indiana upon having brought up this matter with a view to reaching a conclusion at the earliest possible moment. I think the propriety of this discussion about voting upon the several amendments and on the bill itself at the earliest possible moment is admitted by all. Certainly I am anxious for it. But it is evident that it is impossible to come to any definite conclusion about all the amendments and the bill itself this afternoon.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. All right.

Mr. GORMAN. I think, however, what has been said has put the Senate in such a frame of mind that the Senator himself will be able to go on probably without any agreement and we will begin voting on the amendments at an early day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the request of the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do not urge it, but I will say to Senators that I shall renew it at times when Senators' minds may have become settled on the subject. Do I understand that the Senator from Maryland will this evening object to my last request?

Mr. GORMAN. I think it is utterly impossible to agree to it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. At the present time. Very well; I will not urge it further this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana withdraws the request.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No; I do not withdraw the request. I do not urge it further this evening.

IMPEACHMENT OF JUDGE CHARLES SWAYNE.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Without displacing the unfinished business, I ask unanimous consent for the reference of the resolution which I send to the Chair.

The resolution was read, and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses incident to the impeachment trial of Charles Swaine, judge for the northern district of Florida, be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the Sergeant-at-Arms.

SARAH A. ROWE.

Mr. McCUMBER. I submit a concurrent resolution asking for the return of a bill, as the beneficiary has died.

The concurrent resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President be requested to return to the Senate the bill (S. 5501) entitled "An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Rowe."

LANDS IN GLOUCESTER, COUNTY, N. J.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 5763) granting certain property to the county of Gloucester, N. J., which was, on page 1, line 8, after the word "acres," to insert "including the monument site 20 feet square."

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 17474. An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs; and

H. J. Res. 181. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to transfer to the militia cavalry organization at Chattanooga, Tenn., a certain unused portion of the national cemetery reservation at Chattanooga, Tenn., was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Mr. LODGE. I submit a conference report on House bill 14623, to amend the act providing civil government in the Philippine Islands. The report has already been read to the Senate. The conferees have made a slight change in the original report, and I suggest that it be printed and go over without being read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be printed and go over. Does the Senator ask to have it again printed in the RECORD?

Mr. LODGE. I think it had better be printed again in the RECORD in order to show the portion which was omitted from the former conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

The report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 14623) to amend an act approved July 1, 1902, entitled "An act temporarily to provide for the administration of the affairs of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," and to amend an act approved March 8, 1902, entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenue for the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes," and to amend an act approved March 2, 1903, entitled "An act to establish a standard of value and to provide for a coinage system in the Philippine Islands," and to provide for the more efficient administration of civil government in the Philippine Islands, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2 and 3, and agree to the same with amendments.

Amendment numbered 2, section 3, page 4, line 4, after the word "legislation," insert the words "to be approved by the President of the United States."

Page 4, line 14, change colon to a period and strike out the words "Provided further, That no such municipality shall exercise the power to issue such bonds without the prior approval of the President."

Amendment numbered 3, section 4, page 6, line 15, strike out the words "chief executive" and insert in lieu thereof the word "governor-general."

Page 7, after line 10, insert the following: "Fourth. That after the construction and equipment of said railroad in accordance with the foregoing provisions and all others of the contract of guaranty the railroad shall apply its gross earnings as follows: First, to the necessary operating expenses, including reasonable expenses of the corporation; second, to the necessary and ordinary repairs of said railroad and its equipment; third, to such betterments and extraordinary repairs of said railroad or equipment as may be first by the governor-general of the islands, in writing, expressly consented to; fourth, to the payment of the interest on the bonds, the interest on which to any extent shall have been guaranteed by the Philippine government under this section."

Page 7, line 13, strike out the word "same" and insert in lieu thereof the words "said contract of guaranty."

In the same line strike out the words "signed and delivered" and insert in lieu thereof the word "executed."

Page 8, strike out line 11 and insert in lieu thereof the words "said government."

Page 8, line 20, after the word "the," insert the word "Philippine" and strike out the words "have the power to."

Page 9, after line 2, insert the following: "The supreme court of the Philippine Islands shall have original and exclusive jurisdiction in all actions, proceedings, or suits at law or in equity brought by the Philippine government against any person or corporation involving the construction of this section or any right existing under, duty enjoined, or act prohibited by said section or any contract made in pursuance thereof; and jurisdiction is hereby vested in the supreme court to make such order, to enter such judgment or decree, and to take such proceedings in enforcement thereof as may be proper. During the vacations of said court the chief justice or any judge thereof shall have all the power to grant restraining orders, orders of injunction, to appoint receivers, or to do any other act under authority herein granted that a judge of a court of general jurisdiction may do in the vacation of court."

Page 9, line 6, after the word "purposes," insert the words "approved July 1, 1902, so far as the same is not in conflict with the provisions of this section."

Same line, after the word "corporations," insert the words "the interest upon."

Page 9, line 7, after the word "bonds," insert the words "or any part thereof."

HENRY CABOT LODGE,
EUGENE HALE,
FRED T. DUBOIS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

HENRY ALLEN COOPER,
J. A. TAWNEY,
E. D. CRUMPACKER,
W. C. JONES,
JOHN W. MADDOX,

Managers on the part of the House.

AFFAIRS IN SANTO DOMINGO.

Mr. BACON. I beg leave, out of order, to offer a Senate resolution. I ask that it may be read, and then, if agreeable to the Senate, that it may have present consideration.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia was recognized.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I ask the Senator from Georgia to yield, and I will state the request of the Senator from Georgia. I am asking unanimous consent, if the Senator from Georgia will be so gracious as to yield.

Mr. BACON. I do so, with the greatest pleasure.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid aside for the purpose of the consideration of the Senator's matter, and, further, for the rest of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside for the remainder of the day. Without objection, it is so ordered. The resolution submitted by the Senator from Georgia will be read:

The Secretary read as follows:

Whereas in the public press of January 22, 1905, there appeared the following dispatch purporting to be a press dispatch from Santo Domingo, in the Republic of Santo Domingo, to wit:

"SANTO DOMINGO, REPUBLIC OF SANTO DOMINGO, January 21.

"A protocol between the Dominican Government and the American minister, Mr. Dawson, and Commander A. C. Dillingham, United States Navy, in behalf of the American Government, was signed yesterday.

"The principal conditions are that the American Government guarantees the complete integrity of Dominican territory, agrees to undertake the adjustment of all obligations of the Dominican Government, foreign and domestic, and the conditions of payments, to adjust unreasonable claims, and to determine the validity and amount of pending claims. In the case of the appointment of one or more commissions to reach such an adjustment the Dominican Government shall be represented in order to protect its responsibility.

"The American Government will take charge of the existing custom-houses and those hereafter to be created, and will name the employees necessary to their management, the duties they will exercise, and their rights. These will be considered Dominicans and subject to the laws of the Republic. The Dominican Government will have at each custom-house inspectors in behalf of its interests from after the date the contract takes effect. The present employees are to be considered as acting under its provisions.

"DIVERSION OF REVENUES.

"Out of the revenues collected at the custom-houses of the Republic the American Government will deliver to the Dominican Government 45 per cent of the total of the gross amount for the purpose of attending to the necessities of the budget. It is estimated that the first year \$900,000 will be receivable monthly. The advance payments are divided into four installments in the following manner: Eighteen thousand seven hundred and fifty dollars on the 1st, 8th, 15th, and 22d of each month. In case the total revenues of the first or subsequent year are less than \$2,000,000, the payments may be proportionately decreased.

"Out of the 55 per cent the American Government will pay the employees of the custom-houses and the interest on the amortization of the foreign and domestic debts. The whole surplus may remain, and each fiscal year will be delivered to the Dominican Government and devoted to the payments of its debts.

"No changes in the present import dues or port charges will be made without the consent of the American Government until the debt is completely paid.

"GENERAL GUARDIANSHIP.

"The American Government, at the request of the Dominican Government, shall grant such other assistance in its power to restore the credit, preserve order, increase the efficiency of the civil administration, and advance the material progress and welfare of the Republic.

"The agreement will take effect February 1 next.

"The Americans here say Minister Dawson and Commander Dillingham deserve credit for the extremely quick settlement of the Dominican problem, and it is claimed that the execution of the agreement undoubtedly will be beneficial to the Republic.

"President Morales has presented Commander Dillingham with the gold pen used in signing the protocol.

"Quiet prevails here and is expected to continue;" and

Whereas on this 23d day of January, 1905, there appeared in the public press the following, purporting to be an authorized statement from the Secretary of State of the United States, to wit:

"After a consultation with Secretary Hay the following statement regarding the situation in Santo Domingo was issued by Assistant Secretary Loomis yesterday:

"The Dominican Republic, after mature consideration of existing conditions, has formally and freely invited the Government of the United States to assist it in the administration of its customs revenues and to aid it in establishing its fiscal system upon a firm and business-like basis. The Government of the United States having been explicitly, repeatedly, and emphatically informed by more than one of the great powers that it ought either to try to evolve some order out of the financial chaos in the Dominican Republic or assent to certain European creditors of that Republic doing this, and to the administration of the Dominican custom-houses by them, supported by their war ships, has deemed it advisable, in view of the unfortunate financial conditions in Santo Domingo, which for the last ten years have been rapidly growing worse, to accept the invitation of the Dominican Government, and, therefore, representatives of this Government and of Santo Domingo have signed a memorandum of a proposed agreement looking to the American control of the fiscal affairs, upon the request and with the consent of the Dominican Government.

"The United States proposes to guarantee the territorial integrity of the Dominican Republic. It is not the purpose of this Government to assume a protectorate over Santo Domingo or to interfere with or participate in its domestic affairs any further than the collection of its customs revenues, the necessary revision of its tariff laws, and the adjustment, through properly constituted tribunals or commissions, of its foreign claims and its economic and fiscal organization on a sound basis may make it essential to do.

"DECREE BY PRESIDENT MORALES.

"President Morales has signed a decree, which will be published to-day, in which the Government of the United States is officially asked to take full charge of all the Dominican custom-houses; to name all the employees, and to collect all the revenues, 45 per cent of which are to be returned to the Dominican Government for its current expenses; the balance is to be used to meet the interest charges on the acknowledged bonded indebtedness and other just obligations of the Republic. Any surplus will be turned over to the Dominican Government. The obligations representing the bonded indebtedness are largely owned by foreign creditors.

"The Government of the United States does not guarantee the debts of Santo Domingo or agree to provide for the payment of them, but only promises to try to so organize and adjust the fiscal administration of the country that in time their liquidation may be accomplished automatically and on a basis of equity toward all creditors. It is believed that if the Dominican revenues are wisely collected and disbursed all legitimate claims against the Republic will be ultimately satisfied.

"In this connection it may be added that under the award of the tribunal of arbitration of July 14, 1904, between the United States and Santo Domingo, in the sum of about \$4,500,000, the United States was given the right eventually to take possession of the four principal ports on the northern side of the island, and under the award the fiscal agent appointed by the United States is now in possession of the important custom-house at Puerto Plata.

"QUESTIONS FRAUGHT WITH PERIL.

"The unfortunate financial condition of Santo Domingo more than once in the last decade has brought to the United States Government questions fraught with imminent peril. The Government of the United States could not, with due self-respect, allow the impression to deepen and gain currency that the Monroe doctrine can be used as a shield by an American republic to deny justice to other governments. Many foreign claims are just beyond peradventure, and, being held by citizens of various governments, the problem became increasingly more difficult as to how those claims could be satisfied under existing conditions with fair treatment toward all.

In some respects a still more embarrassing feature of the situation has been that the Dominican Government has been compelled by force to pay grossly exorbitant claims, and the question has arisen whether the United States should interpose in such cases. Such interposition has never been resorted to perhaps but once in our history. Another deplorable feature of the financial situation in Santo Domingo is that her revenues have been crippled by granting, for a song, valuable concessions which were exempted by stipulation from all taxation. Her interests have compelled the Dominican Government to disregard these promises of exemption from taxation, and this has resulted in numerous and increasing appeals to the Department of State to interfere.

"The Dominican Government itself reached the conclusion that its only hope of escape from bankruptcy was through the assistance of the United States Government in the organization of its finances. In view of these grave conditions the President has deemed it wise at this time to assent to the strongly expressed wish of the Dominican Government.

Rear-Admiral Charles D. Sigbee, commander in chief of the Caribbean squadron, reported his arrival at Santo Domingo city yesterday in the flagship Newark. Both the Newark and the Castine are now representing the United States in Santo Domingo waters, although the latter has been scheduled to carry Capt. A. C. Dillingham to San Juan, P. R., where he is to take the mail steamer for the United States; and

Whereas it is stated in the said publications that the agreement therein set forth will take effect February 1 next, and that the war ships of the United States have already been sent to the harbor of Santo Domingo, and are present therein: Therefore

Resolved, That the President is respectfully requested, so far as the same may be compatible with the public interest, to inform the Senate whether any agreement has been made between the United States and the Republic of Santo Domingo, and if so, the nature and terms of said agreement; and particularly whether any agreement has been made by which this Government undertakes to guarantee the integrity of the territory or Government of the Republic of Santo Domingo, and whether under said agreement this Government assumes any responsibility or obligation, pecuniary or otherwise, to the said Republic of Santo Domingo or to any other government in behalf or account of said Republic of Santo Domingo.

Mr. BACON. I desire to correct the phraseology, and instead of the words "so far as the same may be compatible with the public interest," make it read "if not incompatible with the public interest."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia makes the following modification.

Mr. BACON. It is simply a change of phraseology.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate, That the President is respectfully requested, if not incompatible with the public interest—

Mr. SPOONER. Let it read "if not in his judgment incompatible with the public interest."

Mr. BACON. I have no objection to that modification.

Mr. LODGE. I think that the resolution should go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will go over.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. It will be printed, I suppose.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that it may go over and be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be printed, under the rule.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After eight minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 24, 1905, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 23, 1905.

SECRETARY OF EMBASSY.

Charles Richardson, of Massachusetts, now secretary of the legation at that place, to be secretary of the embassy of the United States at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, to fill an original vacancy.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Erwin S. Cooley, of New Jersey, to be a second assistant engineer in the Revenue-Cutter Service of the United States, with the rank of third lieutenant, to succeed Michael N. Usina, promoted.

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY.

Joseph M. F. McGinty, a citizen of New York, to be a chaplain in the Navy from the 16th day of January, 1905, to fill a vacancy existing in that grade on that date.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

Assistant Naval Constructor Guy A. Bisset, to be an assistant naval constructor in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 31st day of August, 1904.

Assistant Naval Constructors John E. Bailey, and Henry M. Gleason to be assistant naval constructors in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, from the 30th day of September, 1904.

Lieut. Commander James H. Sears to be a commander in the Navy from the 12th day of January, 1905, vice Commander William P. Day, promoted.

Lieuts. (Junior Grade) Frederick J. Horne, jr., James R. Combs, and Charles H. Fischer to be lieutenants in the Navy from the 1st day of January, 1905, to fill vacancies created by the act of March 3, 1903.

Gunner Patrick Hill to be a chief gunner in the Navy, from the 29th day of October, 1904, upon the completion of six years' service, in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress approved April 27, 1904, to correct the date of his promotion as confirmed on December 16, 1904.

POSTMASTERS.

ALABAMA.

George F. Schad to be postmaster at Brewton, in the county of Escambia and State of Alabama, in place of Charles F. Rankin, resigned.

CALIFORNIA.

Jesse H. Dungan to be postmaster at Woodland, in the county of Yolo and State of California, in place of Jesse H. Dungan. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1905.

Frank H. Owen to be postmaster at Winters, in the county of Yolo and State of California, in place of Frank H. Owen. Incumbent's commission expired June 5, 1904.

COLORADO.

Thomas H. Davy to be postmaster at Fort Collins, in the county of Larimer and State of Colorado, in place of William V. Roberts, removed.

ILLINOIS.

Daniel A. Williams to be postmaster at Antioch, in the county of Lake and State of Illinois. Office became Presidential July 1, 1904.

Etta M. Perdue to be postmaster at Marshall, in the county of Clark and State of Illinois, in place of John C. Perdue, deceased.

INDIANA.

Henry W. Bennett to be postmaster at Indianapolis, in the county of Marion and State of Indiana, in place of George F. McGinnis. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1904.

KENTUCKY.

J. L. Grissom to be postmaster at Burnside, in the county of Pulaski and State of Kentucky. Office became Presidential January 1, 1905.

MICHIGAN.

Justin A. Harsh to be postmaster at Tekonsha, in the county of Calhoun and State of Michigan, in place of Justin A. Harsh. Incumbent's commission expires February 4, 1905.

Guy C. Mars to be postmaster at Berrien Springs, in the county of Berrien and State of Michigan, in place of Andrew W. Mars. Incumbent's commission expires February 4, 1905.

Hugh W. Parker to be postmaster at Bancroft, in the county of Shiawassee and State of Michigan, in place of Hugh W. Parker. Incumbent's commission expires February 4, 1905.

MINNESOTA.

Adolphus L. Elliott to be postmaster at Paynesville (late New Paynesville), in the county of Stearns and State of Minnesota, in place of Adolphus L. Elliott, to change name of office.

Truman B. Horton to be postmaster at Stewartville, in the county of Olmsted and State of Minnesota, in place of Truman B. Horton. Incumbent's commission expires January 31, 1905.

Mark M. Woolley to be postmaster at Howard Lake, in the county of Wright and State of Minnesota. Office became Presidential January 1, 1905.

MISSISSIPPI.

Jennie D. Ligon to be postmaster at Gloster, in the county of Amite and State of Mississippi, in place of Jennie D. Ligon. Incumbent's commission expires January 31, 1905.

Allison S. Pitts to be postmaster at Hattiesburg, in the county of Perry and State of Mississippi, in place of Allison S. Pitts. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1904.

Mary G. Stone to be postmaster at Iuka, in the county of Tishomingo and State of Mississippi, in place of Rufus C. Skinner. Incumbent's commission expires March 2, 1905.

Houston M. Tubb to be postmaster at Amory, in the county of Monroe and State of Mississippi. Office became Presidential October 1, 1904.

NEW JERSEY.

Obadiah E. Davis to be postmaster at Redbank, in the county of Monmouth and State of New Jersey, in place of William T. Corlies. Incumbent's commission expires January 31, 1905.

NEW YORK.

John N. Van Antwerp to be postmaster at Fultonville, in the county of Montgomery and State of New York, in place of John N. Van Antwerp. Incumbent's commission expired December 13, 1903.

OHIO.

William O. Custis to be postmaster at Jamestown, in the county of Greene and State of Ohio, in place of John R. Crain. Incumbent's commission expired December 12, 1903.

Adolphus D. Haney to be postmaster at Morrow, in the county of Warren and State of Ohio. Office became Presidential January 1, 1904.

Joseph F. Meyers to be postmaster at Minster, in the county of Auglaize and State of Ohio. Office became Presidential January 1, 1905.

David E. Owen to be postmaster at Burton, in the county of Geauga and State of Ohio, in place of Lester Crittenden. Incumbent's commission expires January 31, 1905.

D. C. Pemberton to be postmaster at New Vienna, in the county of Clinton and State of Ohio. Office became Presidential October 1, 1903.

Seymour S. Tibbals to be postmaster at Franklin, in the county of Warren and State of Ohio, in place of Joseph B. Woodward. Incumbent's commission expired May 28, 1904.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Henry Feindt to be postmaster at Lykens, in the county of Dauphin and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Henry Feindt. Incumbent's commission expires February 8, 1905.

Elizabeth H. Ketcham to be postmaster at Narberth, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania, in place of Eliza Ketcham, deceased.

WEST VIRGINIA.

William W. Hamilton to be postmaster at Bramwell, in the county of Mercer and State of West Virginia, in place of William W. Hamilton. Incumbent's commission expired December 20, 1904.

WITHDRAWAL.

Executive nomination withdrawn January 23, 1905.

Thomas B. Van Horne to be postmaster at Franklin, in the State of Ohio.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 23, 1905.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

William G. Wheeler, of Wisconsin, to be United States attorney for the western district of Wisconsin.

PROMOTION IN THE NAVY.

Ensign James Reed, jr., to be an assistant naval constructor in the Navy from the 1st day of January, 1905.

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

Albert Wheelon, of South Dakota, to be register of the land office at Pierre, S. Dak.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Henry E. Cutting, of South Dakota, to be receiver of public moneys at Pierre, S. Dak.

POSTMASTERS.

MAINE.

Jacob F. Hersey to be postmaster at Patten, in the county of Penobscot and State of Maine.

Charles H. Eastman to be postmaster at Millinocket, in the county of Penobscot and State of Maine.

MASSACHUSETTS.

George A. Birnie to be postmaster at Ludlow, in the county of Hampden and State of Massachusetts.

MICHIGAN.

Berton M. Wooley to be postmaster at Elsie, in the county of Clinton and State of Michigan.

Simon H. Heath to be postmaster at Richmond, in the county of Macomb and State of Michigan.

MINNESOTA.

William J. Annon to be postmaster at Anoka, in the county of Anoka and State of Minnesota.

Aaron R. Butler to be postmaster at Bagley, in the county of Clearwater and State of Minnesota.

William H. Smith to be postmaster at Cambridge, in the county of Isanti and State of Minnesota.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Arthur W. Charles to be postmaster at North Conway, in the county of Carroll and State of New Hampshire.

OHIO.

Peter Housel to be postmaster at Shreve, in the county of Wayne and State of Ohio.

Henry H. Dibble to be postmaster at Canal Winchester, in the county of Franklin and State of Ohio.

George R. Garver to be postmaster at Strasburg, in the county of Tuscarawas and State of Ohio.

OREGON.

John Hahn to be postmaster at Astoria, in the county of Clatsop and State of Oregon.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Christmas E. Fitch to be postmaster at Wampum, in the county of Lawrence and State of Pennsylvania.

WISCONSIN.

Robert J. Audiss to be postmaster at Westfield, in the county of Marquette and State of Wisconsin.

Oliver W. Babcock to be postmaster at Omro, in the county of Winnebago and State of Wisconsin.

Charles S. Button to be postmaster at Milton Junction, in the county of Rock and State of Wisconsin.

Martin A. Lien to be postmaster at Black River Falls, in the county of Jackson and State of Wisconsin.

Irwin R. Nye to be postmaster at Wittenberg, in the county of Shawano and State of Wisconsin.

Charles Settergren to be postmaster at Baldwin, in the county of St. Croix and State of Wisconsin.

John C. Southworth to be postmaster at Whitehall, in the county of Trempealeau and State of Wisconsin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, January 23, 1905.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 6450. An act to amend an act authorizing the Winnipeg, Yankton and Gulf Railroad Company to construct a combined railroad, wagon, and foot-passenger bridge across the Missouri River at or near the city of Yankton, S. Dak.; and

S. 6422. An act to amend an act approved February 12, 1901, entitled "An act to provide for eliminating certain grade crossings on the line of the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company, in the city of Washington, D. C., and requiring said com-

pany to depress and elevate its tracks, and to enable it to relocate parts of its railroad therein, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following order:

Ordered, That the Secretary inform the House of Representatives that the Senate is ready to receive the managers appointed by the House for the purpose of exhibiting articles of impeachment against Charles Swayne, judge of the district court of the United States for the northern district of Florida, agreeably to the notice communicated to the Senate.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 6422. An act to amend an act approved February 12, 1901, entitled "An act to provide for eliminating certain grade crossings on the line of the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company, in the city of Washington, D. C., and requiring said company to depress and elevate its tracks, and to enable it to relocate parts of its railroad therein, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives, by Mr. BARNES, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House of Representatives that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On January 19, 1905:

H. R. 15320. An act to amend an act to regulate the practice of medicine and surgery, to license physicians and surgeons, and to punish persons violating the provisions thereof in the District of Columbia, approved June 3, 1896.

On January 20, 1905:

H. R. 15225. An act to amend an act relating to the printing and distribution of public documents, and for other purposes.

On January 21, 1905:

H. R. 7279. An act for an additional circuit judge in the first judicial circuit;

H. R. 11178. An act for the relief of Miss Lelia G. Cayce;

H. R. 16284. An act to transfer Fayette County from western to southern district of Texas; and

H. R. 16582. An act to authorize the Union Trust and Storage Company to change its corporate name.

On January 23, 1905:

H. R. 1979. An act providing for the extension of the national cemetery, on Williamsburg turnpike, near the city of Richmond, Va.; and

H. R. 16160. An act granting to Farwell, Ozmun, Kirk & Co. license to make excavations and place footings in the soil of certain land belonging to the United States at St. Paul, Minn.

IMPEACHMENT OF JUDGE CHARLES SWAYNE.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER and Mr. PALMER rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania rises to offer a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the managers on the part of the House in the matter of the impeachment of Charles Swayne, district judge of the United States in and for the northern district of Florida, be, and they are hereby, authorized to employ a clerk, stenographer, and messenger, and to incur such expense as may be necessary in the preparation and conduct of the case, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers approved by the managers, and the managers have power to send for persons and papers.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and the resolution was agreed to.

GRANT OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO GLOUCESTER COUNTY, N. J.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. I rise to call up the unfinished business of Saturday, being the bill S. 5763.

The SPEAKER. That was a pending bill?

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 5763) granting certain property to the county of Gloucester, N. J.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey moves an amendment, which the Clerk will report.